PARALLAX

The Site of Petrarchism

Early Modern National Sentiment in Italy, France, and England

William J. Kennedy

VISIT…

The Site of Petrarchism

PARALLAX RE-VISIONS OF CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Stephen G. Nichols, Gerald Prince, and Wendy Steiner
SERIES EDITORS

The Site of Petrarchism

Early Modern National Sentiment in Italy, France, and England

William J. Kennedy

The Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore and London

© 2003 The Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2003
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kennedy, William J. (William John), 1942–
The site of Petrarchism : early modern national sentiment in Italy, France, and England / William J. Kennedy.
p. cm.—(Parallax: re-visions of culture and society)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8018-7144-1
1. Petrarca, Francesco, 1304–1374—Influence. 2. Italian literature—History and criticism. 3. French literature—History and criticism. 4. English literature—History and criticism. 5. Sonnet. 6. Nationalism in literature. 7. Politics and literature—Italy. 8. Politics and literature—France. 9. Politics and literature—England. I. Title. II. Parallax (Baltimore, Md.)
PQ4535.K464 2003
851′.1—dc21 2002012549

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

For
Maura and Bill Kennedy-Smith
Liam and Barbara Argyropoulos Kennedy

liber liberis

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

	Acknowledgments	*ix*
	Notes on Sources	*xi*
	Introduction: Fore Sites	1
ONE	*Petrarch and the Site of Petrarchism in Italy*	
1	Petrarch as Commentator: The Search for Italy	23
2	Petrarchan Totems and Political Taboos	37
3	*Amor* and *Patria:* Citing Petrarch in Florence and Naples	54
TWO	*Du Bellay and the Site of Petrarchism in France*	
4	Du Bellay and the Language of Empire: The *Deffence et illustration*	77
5	Totems for Defense: Du Bellay and Marot	94
6	Illustrations of Taboo: Du Bellay, Héroët, Saint-Gelais, Scève	115
7	*Mon semblable, mon frère:* Du Bellay and Ronsard	138
THREE	*The Sidneys and Wroth: The Site of Petrarchism in England*	
8	Courtly and Anti-Courtly Sidneian Identities	163
9	Family Narratives: The Transitional Space of Petrarchism	181
10	An Apology for Uncles: Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poetry*	198

11	Prosthetic Gods: The Liberties of Astrophil and Pamphilia	215
12	Byblis and the Bible: Incest, Endogamy, and Mary Wroth	233
	Conclusion: Far Sites, Father Sites, Farther Sites	251
	Notes	*263*
	Primary Sources Cited	*367*
	Index	*373*

Acknowledgments

These pages have profited greatly from the help and advice of friends who have read or listened to many drafts in progress. I especially thank Rebecca Bushnell, JoAnn Della Neva, Roland Greene, Timothy Hampton, Lyn Kelsey, Ignacio Navarrete, Deborah Parker, Richard Peterson, Anne Lake Prescott, and Alan K. Smith. I thank Katherine Reagan and the wonderful staff at Cornell's Karl A. Kroch Rare Book Library for facilitating my repeated access to its magnificent Willard Fiske Dante and Petrarch Collection. For their generous critique and unfailing encouragement of my work, I am indebted to nearly every member of Cornell's departments of Medieval Studies and Comparative Literature and to colleagues from a half-dozen other departments who participate in Cornell's Renaissance Colloquium. I am especially indebted to Calum M. Carmichael for providing splendid insight into the biblical texts I have quoted. I am continually grateful to Mary Lynch Kennedy for surmising that one advantage of having a spouse so obsessed with the past is that he's apt to find you even more interesting the older you get. I am deeply grateful to the Rockefeller Foundation for a fellowship at the Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, where I began revising my preliminary foul papers. I dedicate the result to two couples, the first of whom walked propitiously into my study the instant I laid down my pen on a reasonable fair copy and the second of whom walked bravely down the aisle as this book entered production at the Johns Hopkins University Press. I thank Trevor Lipscombe for his tact and resourcefulness as an editor, Elizabeth Gratch for her cheerful and keen-eyed work as a copy editor, and Tom Roche for his expert guidance as production editor.

This page intentionally left blank

Note on Sources

Quotations from primary sources used more than once refer to editions named in the works cited section. All other primary sources and all references to scholarly and critical studies appear in the endnotes. As my copy text for Petrarch's *Rime sparse,* I use Marco Santagata's superb new edition, but I have profited greatly from the older annotated editions of Gianfranco Contini and Giosué Carducci listed in the works cited. Likewise, as my copy-text for Du Bellay's poetry I use Daniel Aris and Françoise Joukovsky's recent edition, but I have also profited from the older annotated editions of Ernesta Caldarini, J. Jolliffe, and Michael Screech listed in the works cited. I quote from Robert Durling's translation of *Petrarch's Love Poems* throughout, though in a few cases I have modified it to concur with my critical understanding. I quote from existing published translations of other texts whenever possible, and I list them accordingly in the notes or in the works cited. All quotations from Scripture are taken from the Geneva Bible of 1560; nearly contemporary with the major French and English texts discussed in this book, it echoed Calvinist commentary produced in France and was the translation preeminently available to the Sidney family in England. All other translations are my own.

This page intentionally left blank

The Site of Petrarchism

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Fore Sites

The Site of Commentaries

This book proceeds from two premises. The first is that the Petrarchan sonnet, the most widespread vernacular literary mode in elite circles of sixteenth-century Europe, provides a site for early modern expressions of national sentiment. The second is that Petrarchism unfolds amid critical commentary appended to early modern printed editions of the *Rime sparse* and that it acquires a protonationalist density through this commentary. The first premise is not controversial. Petrarch's fourteenth-century lyric poetry recounts its speaker's identification with his native Italy, his awareness of being Italian, and his sense of belonging to a community larger than a local or regional one. These sentiments sprang partly from his experience of exile, as his father, banished from Guelph Florence, took the family to Avignon, where the poet grew up near the papal court.[1] One hundred and fifty years after Petrarch's death his *Rime sparse* and *Trionfi* came to be canonized as supreme models of Italian literary style and Italian patriotic emotion, lending themselves to linguistic imitation throughout the Italian peninsula and eventually to stylistic imitation in other European vernaculars, providing a standard beyond that of local dialects.

So far these claims echo conventional literary history. My second premise, however, requires proof that this book will supply. Petrarch's *Rime sparse* reached its fifteenth- and sixteenth-century European readership in printed editions with sometimes extensive marginal commentaries surrounding its poetic texts.[2] The history of these commentaries records a narrative of multiple

Petrarchs who, in different ways, according to different commentators, responded to provocative issues about politics, religion, love, erotic relationships, family origins, social class, and local self-awareness. The commentaries' impact upon the reception of Petrarch and Petrarchism was considerable, affecting the way creative writers approached Petrarchan forms in Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany, Eastern Europe, and finally the New World. The Petrarchan lyric affords an especially fertile site (in the familiar sense of a place or position set aside for some purpose) for the emergence of particular national styles throughout Europe, and the Petrarchan commentaries provide another fertile site (in the architectural sense of a framework or foundation for further building) for articulating ideological concerns and emergent national identities.

The visual sight (pun intended) of these commentaries implies their function. They surround the poetry with an ocean of annotations, observations, and interpretations, the result of which is to profile not one Petrarch but many. In addition to multiplying the possibilities of understanding Petrarch's work through competing accounts of its achievement, these commentaries provide us with a goldmine of information about how sixteenth-century readers across Europe saw Petrarch, how they construed his national sentiment, and how they constructed their own national awareness. The poet's love affair with Laura, lasting from 1327 to 1348, began and ended near Avignon in southern France, where Petrarch lived intermittently for forty-one of his seventy years. His ancestors, however, hailed from Florence. In 1341 King Robert of Naples approved his crowning as poet laureate at the Senate in Rome. Not Naples, not Rome, but Milan and Parma proved to be the sites of Petrarch's longest continuous Italian residence, when he served the Visconti lords from 1353 to 1361. In the final decade of his life he resided alternately at Venice, Padua, and Arquà. Throughout his life he traveled widely, visiting Paris, Lyon, Prague, Vienna, and possibly London. One upshot of Petrarch's ceaseless migration is that competing regional centers of Europe claimed him as their own.

By the second quarter of the sixteenth century poets across Europe came to cite (again a homonym) Petrarch as preeminently Italian and specifically Tuscan and Florentine, even though in his lifetime he had spent no more than ten days in the city of his father's birth.[3] The conferral of this identity was the work of Pietro Bembo and his circle as propagandists for the restored Medici family.[4] As even Machiavelli had come to regard political hegemony under the Medici as one way to confederate Italy, so Bembo proposed a cultural hegemony under Petrarch and Boccaccio in the Tuscan vernacular as models for

Italian literary discourse.[5] Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* (1525) canonized Petrarch and Boccaccio as supreme exemplars of poetic and prose styles, respectively, and their dominance as models for literary Italian remained unrivaled for three centuries.

Earlier commentaries on Petrarch tell a different story. The first printed editions of the *Rime sparse* appeared at the end of the fifteenth century under the auspices of northern Italian patronage. Commentaries accompanying them written by Antonio da Tempo (composed in the 1420s at Padua and printed at Venice in 1477), Francesco Filelfo (composed ca. 1447 at Milan and published at Bologna in 1476), and Hieronimo Squarzafico (composed at Verona and published at Venice in 1484) identify Petrarch as a public servant of the Visconti at Milan and as a champion of Milanese Ghibellinism.[6] The most widely reprinted commentary of the sixteenth century, composed in 1525 by Alessandro Vellutello of Lucca, a freelance editor at Venice, rearranges the order of the poems in the received sequence so as to concur with events in the poet's biography.[7] Vellutello emphasizes tensions between Petrarch's service to the popes at Avignon and his attraction toward Italy, on the one hand, and between his love for Laura and his devotion to literature, on the other; the poet's sentiment is torn between public and private life, southern France and northern Italy, secular and contemplative activities. In March 1533 Sylvano da Venafro and in July that same year Giovanni Andrea Gesualdo, both at Naples, published lengthy rhetorical commentaries that lend Petrarch a cultivated aristocratic sensibility. Each represents him as a Castiglionesque courtier at home in any setting that allowed him to exercise his verbal and artistic skills.[8] In their wake Bernardino Daniello, an accomplished humanist scholar at Venice who edited the *Rime sparse* in 1541, glossed Petrarch's debts to classical antecedents, according him a cosmopolitan sensibility that harks back to ancient Greece and Rome.[9] Finally, several commentators attracted to Lutheran reform depict Petrarch as a proto-Protestant critic of the papacy, an opponent of Scholastic dogma, and a precocious reader of Scripture. The commentaries of Fausto da Longiano (Modena, 1532), Antonio Brucioli (Ferrara, 1548), and Lodovico Castelvetro (late 1540s, published at Basel in 1582, suppressed in Italy but circulating in northern Europe) portray his sentiment as compatible with Protestant reform.[10]

From this welter of competing constructions emerges a Petrarch who could be anything and everything to all readers. To those outside of Italy Petrarch might seem the exemplar of a pan-Italian sentiment as well as of local and regional attachments. As his poetry supplied the dominant model for sixteenth-

century European elite culture, it became a site of emergent national consciousness and of specific regional belonging. It is of course anachronistic to impute ideas of "nationalism" to sixteenth-century Europe. Nations as we now speak of them are political formations that provide a basis of social and cultural identity in a world transformed by postrevolutionary industrialism, technology, commerce, and communication.[11] Important studies documented in the endnotes to this book nonetheless try to push forward to the early modern period the idea, if not of nations politically defined, at least of national sentiments socially and culturally articulated.[12] I join them in using the words *nation* and *national* as a synecdochic shorthand to express the tensile drift of local or regional identities toward a larger corporate whole adumbrating but not functioning the same as modern "national" identities. The effect of expressing complex local attachments in a heightened form merges with that of expressing supraregional sentiments in a nascent form.

In the history of Petrarchism these effects reinforce one another. Petrarchism echoed laterally through the courts of Europe as a nearly universal literary phenomenon, but it also gave shape and definition to highly particularized literary vernaculars. Bembo's standardizing of an Italian literary language based on Petrarch's style inspired analogous efforts across Europe. In his *Obras* of 1543 Juan Boscán showcased his own and Garcilaso de la Vega's display of Petrarchan conventions in an elegant Castilian style as a model for the Spanish vernacular and, within a generation, academics at the universities of Salamanca and Alcala augmented his efforts with treatises on the refined use of the vernacular. Joachim Du Bellay's *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse* (1549) and its accompanying *Olive* (1549–50) urged an imitation of Petrarchan style as a way to enrich the French vernacular and advance a national literary discourse. Philip Sidney's *A Defence of Poetry* (ca. 1580) and *Astrophil and Stella* (ca. 1581–82), his sister Mary Sidney's translation of Petrarch's *Triumph of Death* (1590), and their niece Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* (1621) showed how a Petrarchan style could empower English literary expression. Elsewhere across Europe Petrarchism served to jump-start other literary vernaculars.

How and why such writers came to cite Petrarch as a model for expressing national sentiment forms the topic of this book. That these writers approached Petrarch's poetry through commentaries appended to early printed editions of the *Rime sparse* might explain the how. The why raises different issues associated in my view with conflicting representations of Petrarch in the commentaries. Despite their great variety and sometimes discrepant claims, all

the commentaries focus on his status as an exile. An inhabitant of multiple sites but the possessor of none, Petrarch grounds a factitious sense of his identity in a recollection of classical culture, ancient Roman civilization, Christian teaching, and late medieval remnants of Siculo-Tuscan and Florentine literary texts that lay at hand. As I shall argue in part 1, this composite of ancestral sources, begetters of Petrarch's imagined cultural patrimony rather than of any existing political *patria,* assumes a totemic function in his cognitive system.

Totemic here refers, in the sense that Freud gave it in *Totem and Taboo,* to an organizing principle that confers a bond of group identity upon ambivalent subjects as a substitute for some figure of authority which once inflicted pain on them.[13] In this case the offending figure is the Florentine republic that has rejected Petrarch and his father, while the substitute is an ancient classical civilization associated with Rome and the greater part of the Italian peninsula. Working hard to recover and assimilate what has been lost or denied in the past, Petrarch invests this totemic substitute with supreme value. In so doing, he edits out of his personal history the painful, disagreeable elements of political exile and replaces them with a new narrative of cultural patrimony. In this narrative Petrarch is no longer the despised offspring of a fractious Florentine city-state but the inheritor of a grander, nobler, more virtuous, and more enabling civilization. His true parentage is neither Guelph nor Ghibelline but a Greco-Roman, Judeo-Christian, sometime republican, sometime imperial culture. The process corresponds to what Freud represents in his essay on "Family Romances" as the replacing of a real begetter by a superior one.[14]

The terminology and conceptual structure of Freud's social psychology help to situate diverse fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentaries on the *Rime sparse* and their effects on early modern imitations of Petrarch. I find them useful not because they explain once and for all the psychological impact of Petrarch's poetry but because they bring an array of social, cultural, political, and economic features of that poetry into an explanatory focus. To put it another way, their social, cultural, political, and economic concerns illuminate historical factors pertinent to the reception of Petrarch's texts in this period. Lorenzo de' Medici nurtured a Petrarchan revival to bolster the totemic value of Florence's cultural hegemony, turning Petrarch's evaluation of ancient models into a revaluation of Florentine ones. Cariteo, a Spanish émigré at the court of the viceregal government of Naples, used the style to reconnect the former kingdom with the rest of Italy. As we shall see at the end of part 1, both Lorenzo and Cariteo reinvented Petrarch's narrative to affirm more exalted cultural pedigrees than the ones that they inherited.

The dissemination of Petrarchism beyond Italy mirrors this pattern. Spain, the first European site outside of Italy to cultivate Petrarchan style, fixed its identity as a nation-state rather quickly at the end of the fifteenth century in an effort to meet the goals of the *reconquista.* Seventeenth-century Germany, late in adopting Petrarchan models, resisted union as Protestant and Catholic factions fought for control over independent territories. Sixteenth-century France and England, the sites of focus in parts 2 and 3 of this book, offer more ambivalent, more complicated, and therefore, I argue, more instructive examples. Here we might think of *site* in the military sense of a fortress or entrenchment positioned to attack or defend. Both France and England, riven with internal factionalism, the former on religious grounds, the latter on grounds of monarchical succession, experienced corresponding degrees of tension and dispute in their cultural expression. The elite cultures of both France and England divided those who would replicate a medieval canon from those who would generate new forms through a takeover of foreign models, itself resulting in a reaction-formation of strategized tribal identity among those who participated in this effort. It seems no accident that the word *defense* figures in the titles of apologues by Joachim Du Bellay and Philip Sidney, which I will analyze in the second and third chapters.

Profound social impulses encouraging public solidarity underlay these manifestos. In France Du Bellay and his colleagues in the Pléiade brigade, members of the landless nobility that suffered impoverishment after the Hundred Years War, sought to improve their social status with a Petrarchan program of humanist education and literary refinement. Immediately they confronted the problem of obligation to an older homegrown culture that anticipated Petrarchism. Partly by totemizing their canonical literary ancestors and partly by casting a taboo on imitating such eminent predecessors as Marot and the Rhétoriqueurs, they averted fratricidal competition and internal conflict. For all their apparent solidarity, however, various rivalries would beset the Pléiade, as we shall see in the divergent careers of Du Bellay and Ronsard, which I trace in chapter 7. Partly in response to the strain in their relationship, Du Bellay articulates in his poetry a romance of origins in which he gains access to a set of models even more appropriate to cultural diversity than those of his friend.

In England the trappings of such romance find a striking application in the literary work of the Sidney family, consisting of Philip, his siblings Mary and Robert, the former's son William Herbert, and Robert's daughter Mary Wroth, the last two of whom joined in an inbred sexual liaison. I will show in

part 3 that their collective efforts to reclaim a noble pedigree (lost when Philip's aristocratic mother married the commoner Henry Sidney, regained when Mary married the earl of Pembroke, and reinforced when Robert's daughter married Lord Wroth) generated a family history that exalts the virtues, and sometimes derides the foibles, of an emerging English national character. Philip Sidney set an example for his siblings and their children when, in order to succeed among the intimates of Queen Elizabeth, he reinvented himself as a Continental courtier bearing a totemic Italianate Petrarchism. This model might seem to challenge Protestant convictions that judged Continental forms as morally decadent, resurrecting a defunct authority associated with papal Europe. But, as I argue in my focus on both courtly and anti-courtly values in chapter 8, once we locate Petrarchism in the context of the commentaries, we find several versions of Petrarch available to Sidney and his heirs. The version that they promoted was decidedly a Protestant one that deepened the expression of national sentiment in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. The personal liberty that it endorsed and the active siblinghood that it promoted, even verging upon incestuous degrees of affection and endogamy, govern my focus in the balance of part 3.

Cultural, political, and literary historians have staked various claims for this surge of supraregional attachments and patriotic identifications. They include the Italian and German territorial consolidation of city-states for economic, military, and judicial purposes, often concentrated on figures of charismatic rulers;[15] the Western European spread of bureaucratic state forms and the fomenting of collective agency in response to social conditions fostering and fostered by high mobility, the growth of capital, and the transformation of public ideals from ones associated with the nobility into ones associated with the people;[16] the rise of Lutheran, Gallican, proto-Anglican, and other forms of religious and cultural pluralism resistant to the universalizing control of the Roman papacy;[17] and an increasingly mobilized opposition to the Other, whether construed xenophobically as neighboring states or self-critically as one's own hated earlier history, now discarded in favor of a brighter future.[18]

Each of these claims has broad merit without telling the whole story. What could? Benedict Anderson has argued that early modern print capitalism helped to standardize social norms that allow the nation to be imagined in a "homogeneous, empty time."[19] Yes, the age of print accelerated such imaginings, but literacy and education, often surprisingly high in the early modern period, reshaped them in timely fluctuation with the push and pull of social, cultural, political, and economic currents in jagged ways. In my view concrete,

limited, sometimes transitory allegiances among people operated at personal, highly contingent levels, with the inflecting power of gender, class, and status modulating their affiliations. From them flow the currents and cross-currents of social, political, economic, and legal institutions and ideas that would later define nation-states in western Europe.

Lyric poetry, despite its highly conventional, highly formalized rhetorical structures, offers especially good insight into these personal, private, and idiosyncratic contours of early national sentiment.[20] Petrarchan lyric poetry allows specific insight because of its elite provenance, linking it to social groups among the aristocracy and professional urban classes with well-defined investments in the ideology of *patria,* race, and nation.[21] Because of its focus on amatory relationships and on the poet's role in relation to patrons, supporters, and other poets, Petrarchan poetry addresses major issues of gender, class, and status which are implicated in expressions of national sentiment.[22] Cariteo's beloved Luna, Du Bellay's Olive, and Philip Sidney's Stella are noble ladies celebrated by upwardly moving, socially mobile members of the lesser aristocracy. The beloved of Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* is a fictive Holy Roman emperor admired by the queen of Morea. While Cariteo sought patronage from the Spanish nobility in Naples, Du Bellay received the patronage of his cousin Cardinal Jean du Bellay, and Philip Sidney claimed access to his uncle the earl of Leicester. As noblewomen, Mary Sidney and Mary Wroth wrote as independent agents. The collective service of these poets in the reigns of the Spanish viceroy in Naples, Henry II in France, and Elizabeth I and James I in England brought them close to the heartbeats of monarchical power. Other more or less contemporaneous genres—the dynastic epic romances of Boiardo, Ariosto, Tasso, and Spenser; the religious epic of Agrippa d'Aubigné; the historical drama of Garnier, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Lope de Vega—may have celebrated the formation of national identities. Petrarch's poetry and that of his imitators did more. They inscribed their readerships onto the site of early modern national sentiment.

The Site of Italy and European National Sentiment

Petrarch's poetry stimulated the development of literary vernaculars in Europe, and it transmitted to them its own sense of cultural awareness inherited from classical and late medieval Italian poetic texts.[23] Concepts of Italy and Italian national sentiment had evolved in the *Rime sparse* after a long and complex history. The name *Italy* appears to have originated in the fifth century

B.C.E., when the Greeks who colonized southern Calabria called it *vitalia* (cattle country; cf. *vitulus,* calf).[24] By the third century B.C.E. the name extended to the entire peninsula south of the Rubicon. In Julius Caesar's time it reached to Cisalpine Gaul. The name evoked a land inhabited by several ethnic groups, including the Gallo-Celts in the north, the Ligurians and Etruscans bordering upon them, kindred tribes of Umbrians, Sabellians, Oscans, and Latins in the center, and Greeks in the far south.[25] The Roman republic's achievement was to have united them all, a multicultural conglomerate of peoples ranging from hardy and frugal mountaineers to easygoing inhabitants of fertile valleys and plains.[26] In *Georgics* 2.136–76 Virgil proclaims that under Augustus no other lands "laudibus Italiae certent" 'may vie with Italy's glories' (138), commending its "ver adsiduum" 'eternal spring' (149), which favors "tot egregias urbes operumque laborem" 'all the noble cities, the achievement of man's toil' (155).

Nine centuries after the fall of the Roman Empire the idea of Italy and its spoken dialects offered Dante a figure of desolation and defeat.[27] In *Purgatorio* 6, after Virgil identifies himself as Mantuan, the expatriate poet Sordello steps forward as "Sordello / de la tua terra!" 'Sordello from your own land!' (74–75). His name rhymes cruelly with the nouns *ostello* and *bordello* which apostrophize a debased Italy: "Ahi serva Italia, di dolore ostello, / nave sanza nocchiere in gran tempesta, / non donna di provincie, ma bordello" 'Ah, servile Italy, hostel of grief, ship without pilot in great tempest, no mistress of provinces, but brothel' (76–78).[28] The complex rhyme pattern in this canto colors the speaker's humiliation. In *De vulgari eloquentia* 1.10 Dante had judged the language of Italy capable of yielding poetry "more sweetly and subtly" than other Romance languages, even though he acknowledged its division into fourteen major vernaculars with countless variants.[29] But Sordello's abandoning his Mantuan tongue for Provençal sadly betokened the impossibility of harmonizing the languages of Italy, a situation that reflects the peninsula's social and political disarray as well.[30] In *Purgatorio* 6 Sordello's evocation of the Italian *terra* prompts Dante to chide the emperor-elect Albert I and his father Rudolf I of Hapsburg for relinquishing their rule to a corrupt clergy. Italy, its language, and its civilization have now become "vedova e sola" 'widowed and alone' (113).

Upon the coronation of Charles IV of Luxembourg and Bohemia as Holy Roman emperor in 1355, a celebrated canzone, "Quella virtù che 'l terzo cielo infonde" 'That virtue that the third heaven infuses' (attributed to Bindo di Cione del Frate), expressed hopes for a united Italy to be ruled by "un vertu-

dioso re che ragion tenga / e la ragion dello 'mperio mantegna" 'a virtuous king who keeps order and maintains the order of the empire' (145–46).[31] Such hopes dissolved when Charles retreated to Prague after his coronation, prompting Petrarch's friend Antonio de' Beccari to forge a canzone of despair about the fate of the empire, "O sacro imperio santo" 'O sacred Holy Empire.'[32] After 1388 a series of sonnets by Francesco da Vennozzo rejected the empire and instead supported Gian Galleozzo Visconti of Milan, the "Conte di Virtù" 'virtuoso Count' as a leader whom all Italy might trust: "Italia, figlia mia, prendi diletto . . . / Che Italia ride ed è zunto 'l Messia" 'Italy, my daughter, rejoice . . . that Italy smiles and her Messiah has arrived.'[33]

As a geographical entity, Italy no longer dominated the Holy Roman Empire. Nor was it a coherent nation, for which concept a substantive noun did not even exist. For both Dante and Petrarch the cognate adjective *natio* designates "native, indigenous." In *Inferno* 10 Farinata degli Uberti displays exorbitant pride in being a *natio* Florentine: "La tua loquela ti fa manifesto / di quella nobil patrïa natio" 'Your speech clearly shows you a native of that noble fatherland' (25–26). In sonnet 194 Petrarch returns from his "natio dolce aere tosco" 'sweet native Tuscan air' to Vaucluse, where Laura resides, "per ritrovar ove 'l cor lasso appoggi" 'to find again a place where my weary heart can lean.' The Tuscan noun that best approximates a concept of nation is *gente,* a collectivity of people, especially foreign peoples, as opposed to those in the more personalized ancestral space of a *patria.* Thus in Dante's *Inferno* 7 Fortune apportions wealth among various *genti* by alternating richness with poverty "di gente in gente e d'uno in altro sangue" 'from people to people, and from one to another blood' (79–80).

Petrarch uses *gente* with scorn to suggest a vulgar crowd or mob: "Seguite i pochi et non la volgar gente" 'Follow the few and not the crowd' (sonnet 99; cf. sonnets 18, 35, and 335). In his political canzoni *gente* designates foreign peoples to the north, where "nemica naturalmente di pace / nasce una gente" 'is born a people naturally the enemy of peace' (28.50–51; cf. 28.101); the oppressed people of Rome, as in the exhortation to Cola di Rienzo to end civil strife "per cui la gente ben non s'assecura" 'because of which the people are not safe' (53.46–47; cf. 53.63, 80); and those who serve the warring lords of northern Italy as mercenaries, "e 'n disparte / cercar gente, et gradire" 'and in foreign parts seek and reward men' (128.61; cf. 128.26, 78, 115).

In 1347 Fazio degli Uberti, a descendant of Dante's Farinata, completed a long didactic travelogue in terza rima, *Il Dittamondo,* in which Solomon guides the exiled speaker on a journey through "lo mondo tutto e la gente"

'the entire world and its people.'[34] When he visits his father's Florence, he burns with love for a *patria* that he has never seen, "Quivi provai come è grande l'amore / della patria" 'Here I experienced how great is the love of one's fatherland' (3.7.5–6). In these lines the poet clearly distinguishes between his *terra natia*, the city of Pisa where he was born during his father's exile, and his ancestral *patria*, the republic of Florence. His deep feelings now embrace a corporate Italy—"Qui sono i collicai dolci e piacevoli, / adombrati e coperti di bei fiori" 'Here are sweet and pleasant hills, shaded and covered with beautiful flowers' (3.11.7–8)—registering his strong sentiment for a geographic entity larger than that of family or place of birth, a depersonalized site that is something less than territorial but something more than a historical memory.

The Latin nouns *gens* and *natio* carry different meanings from those of their fourteenth-century Italian cognates. In Cicero's usage, for example, *gentes* refers to foreign "peoples" whose inferior origins subordinate them to Roman citizens.[35] In late medieval vulgar Latin, *nationes* refers to communities of immigrant scholars united by a common "native" language and place of origin at various universities in western Europe—forerunners of foreign students' unions that shared a set of allegiances within the transnational institutions they belong to.[36] At the University of Paris they included the "nations" of Picardy, Normandy, England, and Germany. In the late thirteenth century the idea of *nation* as a community of opinion was applied to various representatives at church councils who served as spokesmen for diverse secular and religious causes. Because they possessed some cultural and political authority, these spokesmen came to be identified with a ruling elite, a social class that constituted a nation in a narrow sense.[37] In the fourteenth century they generally included representatives from France, Germany, Aragon, and England.

In sixteenth-century England the word *nation* acquired its modern sense as referring to the entire people of a country, the broad expanse of land and small communities facing (*contra,* whence "country") the ruling metropolis and dependent on it.[38] This new usage embraces the lower classes as well as the upper so as to mitigate the formerly derogatory sense of "people" attaching to the lowest stratum of the populace.[39] Both *nation* and *people* now project positive meanings as bearers of sovereignty and units of political solidarity. As the word *nation* came into English, it resonated with the biblical associations of the Latin *gens, gentis* in Jerome's Vulgate. The latter in turn translates the Septuagint Greek *to ethnos*, which denotes a group of foreigners from a single or shared place of origin, in dire circumstances referring to the Jewish people during their nomadic exiles. In Genesis 15.14 "the nacion [*to ethnos* / *gentem*],

whome thei shal serue" means Egypt, the unruly Other that threatens or hinders Jewish sovereignty.[40] But in Genesis 12.2 *nation* means Abraham and his progeny, descendants from one ancestral root (Latin *radix,* whence "race") who will share an ethnic and religious identity when they live as foreigners (*ethnoi*) in Egypt: "I will make of thee a great nation [*ethnos mega*/ *gentem magnam*]."[41] Both meanings of the word span Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* (1598), in which Shylock presents himself as a tribal member of the diasporic Jewish "sacred nation" ghettoized in Venice (1.3.45), while Antonio acknowledges a rule of law that binds "all nations" as discrete foreign political entities and sovereign states (3.3.31).

To quote from the 1560 Geneva Bible and from Shakespeare as I have done brings us from the age of Petrarch to the terminal point of this study in the early seventeenth century. At that time European texts represented the nation as a function of political and ideological, not just geographical determination. This idea had a long gestation. Ancient geographers such as Strabo and Pliny the Elder commented upon the cultural unity of Italy despite the variety of its peoples and extreme differences in its topography.[42] Flavio Biondo's Latin *Italia illustrata* (1453) describes these differences and provides an account of their historical associations. The advent of print subsequently enabled reproducible Portolani maps to present visual cosmographies along with narrative chorographies or discursive accounts of various lands.[43] Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia* (1544), Leandro Alberti's *Descrittione di tutta l'Italia* (1550), Abraham Ortelius' *Theatrum orbis mundi* (1570), and Pietro Bertelli's *Teatro della città d'Italia* (1616) all helped to fix the site of Italy within the world and give it a substantive identity.[44] Despite the diversity of Italy's regional composition and its stubborn particularities, a sense of pan-Italian unity had come to prevail.

Similar features mark the formation of German national sentiment. The latter's origins reach back to the first century B.C.E., when tribal lands in the Saar, Rhine, and Danube basins became Roman provinces, administered through such imperial cities as Trier, Cologne, Mainz, Augsburg, Regensburg, and Vienna.[45] Classical Latin designated this area as *Germania* but called its peoples by their various tribal names. The etymology of *Germania* is uncertain, sometimes held to be a name given by Gauls to their neighbors from Celtic *gair* (neighbor) but also possibly related to Latin *germanus* (brother) (cf. *germen,* shoot, bud), referring to close kinship bonds in its tribal society.[46] Late Roman and early medieval writers favored the word *teutonicus,* derived from *Teutones,* an ancient tribe that inhabited Jutland in the fourth century B.C.E. and with the Cimbri devastated Gaul in 101 B.C.E.[47] In the thirteenth century

these peoples referred to themselves as *Diutisch* (modern *Deutsch*) and to their territory as *Diutischland.*[48] The word derives from the Gothic *thiuda* (people), whence the Old High German *Diet* (an assembly of people) and the adjective *diutisc* (of the people, popular), equivalent to the Latin *vulgaris* in distinguishing the vernacular language and its dialects from the institutional Latin of church and scholarship.[49] Italian and French neighbors later referred to the country as *Allamagnia* or *Allemagne* (from medieval Latin *allemania,* country of the Alemanni), evoking a specific tribe in the upper Rhine-Danube region defeated by Clovis at the end of the fifth century.[50]

Charlemagne's conquest and Christianization of the Saxons in the ninth century helped to confer upon federated German localities a distinct political identity. In 911 the Carolingian succession of the East Frankish kingdom passed to the election of Conrad I, duke of Franconia, as king of Germany.[51] Through his successor Henry I, duke of Saxony, Otto I inherited the kingdom in 936 and was anointed emperor in 962. Five tribal *Stamm* (stem) duchies of Saxony, Franconia, Lorraine, Swabia, and Bavaria formed the core of tenth-century Germany, but already Henry I had sponsored Saxon migrations into the Slav territories of Silesia and Pomerania, and Otto I encouraged Bavarians to move into Magyar lands that later became Austria, the German Österreich. Hapsburg control from 1438 onward projected an illusion of seamlessness upon Germany and the empire, but Germans groups within the empire remained keenly aware of their multiethnic, multinational differences from one another.[52]

Sixteenth-century Spaniards certainly thought of themselves as different from the subjects of Charles V's Hapsburg Empire. Early modern Europe's fiercest defenders of a determinate ethnicity, the Spanish comprise an interracial mixture that is among the most varied and complex (Iberian, African, Roman, Visigothic, Arabic), a fusion registered in the late foreign coinage of the adjective *español.* The word originated in thirteenth-century Provence among pilgrims to Santiago de Compostella in Galicia and was used to designate the heterogeneous mass of Basques, Catalans, Castilians, Leónese, Aragonese, Navarrese, and Galicians who lived south of the Pyrenees.[53] The word echoes the Latin *Hispaniensis,* which first-century B.C.E. Romans applied to inhabitants of the province of Hispania embracing tribal Cantabrians, Asturians, Galicians, and Carthaginians in Iberia (so called from the Greek name for the peninsula, *Iberes*).

Religious differences forged a major taxonomy for Spanish self-definition after Recared I (586–601) converted his followers to Christianity. From the

eighth to the thirteenth centuries Iberian *cristianos* set themselves apart from Arabic Moors and Sephardic Jews.[54] Such kingdoms as Castile, León, Navarre, Aragon, and Catalonia brought further distinctions. The *Crónica General,* commissioned by Alfonso X the Wise (1252–84), imputes a speech to Alfonso VIII of Castile before the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212 in which he addresses his Portuguese and Aragonese allies as "todos nos somos españoles" 'we are all Spanish.'[55] The word *español* henceforth conferred a unity upon Spain's Christians, who would trace their descent from Tubal, the grandson of Noah, "donde vinieron los españoles" 'whence came the Spaniards.'[56] The fifteenth-century *reconquista* of Moorish territories in the south ultimately gave voice to the idea of a *limpiezza del sangre* (purity of blood) which proclaimed a corporate Old Christian ethnic identity.[57] In the year of Ferdinand and Isabella's victory over Granada, Antonio de Nebrija dedicated to the queen his *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492). Proposing Castilian as the best model for a national language, this book—the first European vernacular grammar—privileged Isabella's dialect above all others in the emergent nation, where "siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio" 'language has always been a companion of empire.'[58]

The formation of specifically French and English national sentiments and their inflection in sixteenth-century Petrarchan poetry dominate this book, and parts 2 and 3 will treat this topic in detail. Like the Spanish, French people regarded their common Christianity as the basis for a shared identity. From the start, usually assigned to Clovis's victory over Frankish rivals and his unification of the Paris basin ca. 500 B.C.E., they proudly acknowledged their multiethnic origins as a mosaic embracing Greeks, Romans, Celtic Gauls and Bretons, non-Indo-European Aquitani, Germanic Franks, Visigoths, Burgundians, Norsemen, and more. They derived their name from the Franks, who in turn derived theirs variously from Germanic *franc* (ferocious, barbarous), Latin *fractum* (detached, independent, free), and even Greek *phrenērēs* (sound of mind, prudent, wise).[59]

The Hundred Years War (1337–1453) between France and England doubtless fostered a sense of solidarity among people in Brittany, Aquitaine, and lands north of the Loire against their common enemy across the Channel. But the English upper class also viewed its identity as French. Its claim to the French throne, after all, had caused the war. The English lower classes in turn acknowledged their multiethnic origins as successive waves of Celtic Bretons, ancient Romans, sixth- and seventh-century Angles, Saxons, Danes, and finally eleventh-century Normans crashed on Albion's shores and flooded in-

ward.[60] Like the French, Latin-educated English scholars recounted an originary myth about the settlement of their land by refugees from the Trojan War (led by Hector's son Francus to France and by Aeneas' great-grandson Brutus to Troynovant, the site of London). Seventh-century Latin writers called this people *Angli,* referring to the Danish Angles who had settled in the East Midlands region, while tenth-century vernacular writers called them *Angelcynn* (Angle-kin) and named the land *Angleland* or *Englaland.*

French people developed sentiments about being "French" earlier than the English did of being "English," partly because their administrative structure sustained a longer historical continuity than England's had.[61] But the English seem to have evolved a deeper sense of nationhood as a multiclass, multiethnic community of peoples largely unrelated to one another yet sharing common social, political, and economic goals.[62] If the English brushed aside a sense of cultural unity that the French had nurtured, the French ignored a process of political confederation that had taken root in England. This difference points to the divergent emphases that each later assigned to its idea of national character, the one mirroring the other as an inversion of itself. In the nineteenth century Lord Acton described the English national character as one that resists uniformity and affirms a pluralist accommodation of various interest groups who prize their individuality and unabashed eccentricities.[63] Ernest Renan described its French counterpart as a concept of community predicated on a form of relation, based on the willingness of citizens to surrender their ethnic, cultural, and linguistic particularities to a factitious standard that protects the rights of all.[64] The French attainment of a common culture required an amnesia about its contentious origins and a deliberate effort to shape a social imaginary.[65] But this is of course true of the English imaginary as well. Its myths juxtapose narratives about a state that absorbed the rights of different groups (the Bretons, Saxons, and Normans; the king, nobility, gentry, and commoners), even as its contrarian will to preserve territorial rights, local liberties, and feudal prerogatives led to nearly continual civil strife in the late Middle Ages.[66]

The Site of Language

Parallel to sociocultural differences between the French and the English are their respective early modern attitudes toward language at a time of chaotic variance among dialects and local idioms. The French early on embraced a regularizing of their language and other semiotic modes (fashion in food,

dress, social activities, leisure pursuits), though effective normalization did not occur until the mid-nineteenth century, with the administrative centralization of a public school system.[67] Sixteenth-century speculation about a common French language by Geoffroy Tory, Robert Estienne, Peletier du Mans, and Louis Meigret, echoed by Joachim Du Bellay in his *Deffence et illustration,* guides my analysis of Du Bellay and the language of empire in part 2. The English, on the other hand, have long prized their own irregularities, including a language full of anomaly. What they call the King's English (even when the royals spoke nothing but French or German) is the upper-class dialect of London. George Puttenham in 1589 refers vaguely to this standard as the language heard within a radius of sixty miles of London. But, as my study of Sidneian cultural politics and the linguistic order will show in part 3, other Tudor writers such as Thomas Wilson and Richard Mulcaster simultaneously encouraged a farrago of native coinages and idiosyncratic forms. This peculiarity would enrich English Petrarchism even as it helped to express a distinctive English sentiment in and through the poetry.

Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentaries on Petrarch's *Rime sparse* display the history of Petrarchism as one of negotiation between the imputed universalism of a Petrarchan style shared across Europe and the particularism of its local and regional adaptations. Such writers as Bembo, Boscán, Du Bellay, Sidney, and Opitz encouraged a regeneration of vernacular styles based on Petrarchan models. Still, Du Bellay would doubt whether any standardized (let alone literary) vernacular could provide the glue imputed to it for promoting ideological agreement. In *Deffence* 1.1 and 1.10 he recognizes that no language is innately superior to any other: "Toutes Langues sont d'une mesme valeur, & des mortelz à vne mesme fin d'un mesme jugement formées. Parquoy . . . je croy qu'à un chacun sa Langue puysse competemment communiquer toute doctrine" 'All languages are of a like value, and formed by mortals to a like end with a like judgment. Wherefore . . . do I believe that to each man his language can completely communicate every doctrine' (61/46). The logic of this argument implies that no dialect or stylistic variant of a language trumps any other, unless it acquires social prestige through ascription or convention. Certain uniform modes of discourse can and do bring people together in legal, economic, and administrative exchange, and they play important roles in politics, law, trade, and commerce. Perceptions of correctness or incorrectness in grammar, syntax, spelling, and pronunciation nonetheless segment speakers and writers into hierarchies based on social status, gender differences, and educational attainments.[68] The composite language in its diversity

inexorably reproduces the divisions in society which tug at a sense of corporate political identity.[69]

Far from self-evidently uniting people, then, standards of linguistic usage rather differentiate and discriminate among them, as we shall see in parts 2 and 3.[70] Foreign or regional accent, popular or idiomatic diction, formal or informal style, ostentatious error or correctness, all constitute social markers that locate speakers in hierarchically defined categories. Philip Sidney recognized the social incongruity of his taste for an old Scottish border ballad about Percy and Douglas: "Certainly I must confess my own barbarousness; . . . it is sung but by some blind crowder . . . in the dust and cobwebs of that uncivil age" (*A Defence,* 97). As Sidney knew, differences in status exercise enormous impact upon linguistic usage through upbringing, economic resource, or, as his peers believed, genetic determination.[71] Mary Wroth's titular heroine in *Urania,* a foundling born of royal parents but raised by a shepherd, displays such superior physical and ethical attributes that her royal birth "could not be otherwise," while its principal characters, Pamphilia and Amphilanthus, display such attributes that "kindnesse [i.e. their degree of birth] then betray'd them."[72] Blue-blooded aristocrats flaunt genealogies that link them to famous events in national history and affirm them to be of more valiant stock than commoners with obscure origins.[73]

The sharing of a mother tongue, a common language within broad bounds of local difference, might nonetheless constitute a metaphor for collective origins, a figure of natural inclusion and national coexistence that accepts all who embrace it regardless of social rank or geographical locale.[74] No matter who they are or where they now reside, people belong to the motherland if they speak some variant of its language. Even at a distance across mountains and seas, those who share its tongue feel a sense of attachment to the land of their birth, their *natio.* The idea of a fatherland, a *patria,* implies more restrictive form of coexistence as it embraces only those who formally submit to its laws and orders, as expressed in a particular variant of its language.[75] Rather than simply belonging to it, people aggressively will a fatherland into being by activating its values (classically associated with ancient republican virtue) and defending its sovereignty in a precise lexicon. This father tongue is the acquired discourse of law, education, commerce, and specialized professions, couched in a language such as Latin in the West, Arabic in Islamic countries, and Mandarin in the East.[76] It is learned in the academies by a segment of the population, largely male and wellborn, destined for leadership.

As I will argue in part 1, Petrarchan style provides an apt medium for a na-

tional literary discourse because its scope accommodates the mother tongue of the modern vernaculars to the father tongue of the ancient classics. The *Rime sparse* deploys an artificial, self-consciously constructed amalgam of literary Tuscan, Sicilian, Provençal, and classical Latin, all of them elite forms embedded in textual conventions of antiquity and the later Middle Ages. Fashioned in this composite, such patriotic poems as Petrarch's canzoni 53 and 128 express some of the earliest national sentiment in European letters. But, as a vehicle for predominantly amatory poetry, Petrarch's style favors topics that express personal feelings and interpersonal relationships. It offers a transitional space for freedom, play, and creation which permits access to sometimes discordant and discrepant dreams, exurient desires, and tractable realities. Not the least of its features, as I shall argue at the end of part 3, is that it provides a voice for women to express widely ramifying relationships to place and home. As figures of partitive exchange between families in exogamic marriages, often transported far from their regions of birth to new spousal households, such women become the conveyors of translocal feelings and attachments across permeable boundaries. In their writing on these experiences, national sentiment has an opportunity to take root.[77]

This book will show that national sentiments spring from loyalties to particular people and among classes of people which straddle institutions of state and emblems of rule. In the early modern period such loyalties grew increasingly strong. The formation of nationally organized states and churches gave rise to an increasingly secularized bureaucratic class. The creation of centralized monarchies quelled a powerful clergy and an autarchic feudal nobility. Symbolic trappings of ritual, identification, and pageantry defined and continually redefined states, churches, and monarchies. Each of these forces strengthened the loyalties that I refer to. Collectively, such institutions of state and church, along with their symbolic trappings, enforced order by equating the figure of a ruler with the totalizing, transcendent identity of a territory, culture, and population designated as "the nation."[78] In my view, however, more than any ideological commitment to hegemonic forms of authority, a highly mobile set of loyalties to individual people and specific classes of people ordered society at all levels and provided an immanent basis for national sentiment. Totemic allegiances to households, guilds, neighbors, associates, patrons, clients, and kin usually outweighed notional attachments to emerging national ideals, even as the dynamics of group psychology began to inflame passions about the latter.

Through such networks of loyalty and allegiance, I contend, individuals

sought to replace weaker elements of their identity with stronger ones. In so doing, they felt themselves part of or alienated from conceptions of a *patria* celebrating the heritage of one's ancestors, a race stemming from a common *radix* (root), a *natio* sharing communal associations through birth, settlement, language, or custom. Strictly speaking, only the elite may claim a *patria,* race, or *natio* by virtue of possessing a legal title, a pedigreed lineage, inheritable proprietary rights, something to protect and pass on, and hence something that confers a political status.[79] Still, I would argue for the permeability of boundaries marking social classes in the sixteenth century. The mass of a population could and did share in political claims of the elite by participating in coalitions that the latter formed and by adopting their loyalties and allegiances. Sentiments about the state or nation functioned as no disembodied system of ideological beliefs but, rather, as a congeries of overlapping and often discordant beliefs about *patria,* race, and *natio* held by people across the social spectrum. Different groups put such beliefs into eddying circulation while frankly acknowledging conflicts and divisions among themselves in status, rank, and proprietary rights; and in so doing, they produced a set of ideas about the character of the community which served to define the responsibilities of its individual members. The outcome, founded less on an agreement than on dialogue about what an agreement might mean, allowed such groups and individuals to explore and exploit and, when necessary, to expose and explode phantasms of national solidarity as they resisted domination by more powerful elites.[80] What remains, then, is no solemn, stately, confident march toward the creation and possession of some timeless, universally accepted idea of national character or identity but, instead, an ebb and flow, a jagged history of contending ideas about the possibilities of mobilizing affective national sentiment as a work-in-progress.

In *De vulgari eloquentia* 1.16 Dante implies that the language of poetry could promote cultural values and political myths. The capacious vernacular that he calls "illustrious, cardinal, courtly, and curial" (310/41) might legitimate the dialects of Italy by selecting their best features and making them common to all. It would be courtly in echoing the ceremonial language of a royal court that did not exist but whose potential Italian leaders could emulate and curial in emulating the well-balanced constructions of judicial and administrative officers. But it would be opposed to the "municipal vernacular" of cities, sites of faction and frenzy, arrogance and divisiveness, semaphores of division within Italy. Dante's treatise, however, remained unknown to Italian humanists until Giangiorgio Trissino recovered and published it in 1529. By that time

Bembo's *Prose* had already established Petrarch's model as the basis for Italian literary style.[81]

Only cloistered literary scholars (present company excepted) might assume that poetry or critical theory could have had a real impact on the linguistic development of Italian, Spanish, French, English, or German spoken forms. As a subset of literary style in these languages, international Petrarchism appears a wholly unlikely model for any national style. Petrarchan poetry has little to do with the state vernaculars of early modern Europe, except as providing one among several training grounds in verbal expression for members of the elite who became catalysts for national sentiment in Italy, France, Spain, and England.[82] Its figurative yoking of oxymoronic opposites, its penchant for a multilayered wordplay that incorporates literary, historical, and cultural allusions, and its elaborate protocols of difference and deference in voice and address made it an apt vehicle for developing one's verbal skills. The self-consciousness of Petrarchan style and the dramatic energy of the Petrarchan amatory situation, in which the lover anticipates, manages, and responds to the beloved's nuanced reactions, parallel strategic functions in game theory and state management.[83] These considerations about rhetorical strategy and verbal manipulation return us to the commentaries on Petrarch's poetry which conditioned its reception throughout Europe from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries.

Responsive readers and creative poets found in them variously situated reflections on Petrarch's work. The rhetorical commentaries of Gesualdo, Sylvano da Venafro, and Bernardino Daniello took great care to gloss Petrarch's diction, trace his figurations, explain his tropes, excavate his ancient and medieval sources, and situate his language in a rich stylistic context. The biographical commentary of Vellutello set out to provide a narrative that would link the action described in the poems with the life of the poet, and it delivered a profile of Petrarch's career which shows the connection between his public and political aspirations and his private and poetic goals. Earlier commentaries by Antonio da Tempo, Filelfo, and Squarzafico from the perspective of imperial ideology and northern Italian Ghibellinism focused on Petrarch as a seeker of patronage in aristocratic circles of Milan, Verona, Venice, and Padua. Proto-Protestant commentaries by Fausto da Longiano, Antonio Brucioli, and Castelvetro capitalized upon the poet's criticism of ecclesiastical institutions and church-state relations, representing him as a forerunner of the great sixteenth-century reformers. Their collective impact on the early modern reception of Petrarchan poetry, of the poet's role, of poetic language, and of the interface between poetry and politics shapes the chapters that follow.

1 *Petrarch as Commentator*

The Search for Italy

In his *Familiares* and *Seniles* Petrarch provides his own best commentary on his literary work and on his sentiment as an Italian writer.[1] Carefully collected, revised, edited, and arranged, these letters project the site of his work as one of continual displacement. The introductory letter of the *Familiares* addressed early in 1350 to Ludwig van Kempen, familiarly called "Socrates," a Belgian musician at the papal court of Avignon, concerns time and its disruptions that hamper, ravage, and deform his work. But it equally and perhaps more profoundly concerns space and its dislocations that separate the poet from a community defined as protonational. Petrarch's incipient humanist sense of temporal alienation, his sense of remove from the ancient past, appear to heighten his identity as an exile, a traveler, a wanderer.[2] But an even sharper sense of his spatial disjuncture, first in southern France and then in northern Italy, throws into bold relief his need for a social, cultural, and above all geopolitical site upon which to construct a public and therefore a class- and gender-defined pan-Italian identity.

Familiares 1.1 dramatizes the poet's personal and professional confrontation with deep loss. Composed probably at Padua in the wake of the Black Death, the letter evokes the devastation of 1348.[3] Famine, plague, loss of life, demographic decline, economic upheaval, and public unrest have caused social turmoil, but a keen sense of fleeting time causes even greater psychological turmoil. Needing to edit his letters "scattered [*sparsa,* echoing the adjective that describes his Italian poetry, *Rime sparse*] and neglected" (3/241), Petrarch sees a replication of the humanist hermeneutic in his own writing.[4] Over time his

letters disclose "the changed nature of my own understanding (*intellectus mutata*)" (4/242). Tricks of memory ("I could hardly recognize certain letters") prompt him to revise his *Familiares* toward a goal that would later be identified with "humanist" scholarship: to bridge the distance between past and present by making the past comprehensible to the present. Petrarch stares into an abyss of time frozen by an event in 1345 which inspired him to collect these letters.

In that year Petrarch had discovered at Verona Cicero's long lost letters to Atticus, at once changing his perception of Cicero and unsettling his faith about the past. Recording petty quarrels and parochial invective, these letters belie Cicero's great public reputation.[5] They move Petrarch "in a fit of anger" to write to Cicero "as if he were a friend living in my time, . . . forgetting as it were the gap of time [*quasi temporum oblitus*]" (13/249).[6] Petrarch's passage through this trauma of re-cognition makes him "stronger [*securior*] out of that very state of despair," and it helps his style to grow sinewy, muscular, febrile, "more vigorous [*nerviosior*]" (13/250). Physical and intellectual experience merge at the site of his humanist activity. Summoning the concrete spatial dimension of the humanist project, Petrarch works to "gather together [*recolligo*] his writing in "the form of a book" (13/250). The room where he is ready to incinerate unfit texts seals him off from a world of real or imagined communities that take shape according to social, cultural, and political needs. This interior site is cluttered with unsorted texts but is not lacking in design, since here Petrarch has arranged "little bundles [*sarcinulas*]" of books for an impending journey (3/241).

The writer's self-identification as one about to become a "wanderer" (*migraturus*) projects a different space (3/241).[7] On the one hand, travel expands the writer's mind, range of topics, and available audience. It introduces him to "countless famous men [*notos*]" who will receive his letters (9/246). On the other hand, Petrarch addresses so many diverse audiences that he loses his focus, at times repeating words, inflecting them differently for different readers, contradicting or denying what he has written elsewhere. The result is confusion. The composite volume of his writing has become "a deformity [*deformitas*]" (10/247).

More insistently, travel deprives the writer of a material res publica, the site of heroic activity and participatory local community. Petrarch associates his epistolary style, "plain, domestic, and friendly [*mediocre domesticum et familiare*]," with that of Cicero's letters, not the "almost torrential [*exundans*] kind of eloquence" which the Roman writer elsewhere deployed "against his enemies and those of the Republic" (6/244). Puns and wordplay sap Petrarch's style.[8] Relieved to be "free from all cares of state [*a reipublice muneribus abfui*]"

(6/244), he feels a palpable loss, teasingly expressed as a stylistic breach. If the res publica is a site of heroic male action, Petrarch needs to locate another site where he might deploy his rhetorical skills: "If [this rhetorical power] did abound, I would not know where to exercise it" (7/244), in which the syllables of the protasis (*si exuberet*) punningly reverse those of the object clause (*ubi exerceam*).

Petrarch genders his feelings about such action in a pattern of complex overlapping associations. "Compare my wanderings [*errores*] to those of Ulysses," he writes, summoning Dante's representation in *Inferno* 26 of the defiant old warrior who persuades his men to travel beyond "the borders of his fatherland [*patrios fines*]" (8/245).[9] Ulysses chose to abandon his ancestral domain, but Petrarch's exile was imposed on him, the unwilled result of his father's manly opposition to misguided politics. "Expelled from his native city [the insistently alliterative *pulsus patria pater magna*] with a file of good men [*acie,* a military battle line]" (8/245), the elder Ser Petracco evokes Aeneas in his flight from Troy. Compared with these masculine precedents, the younger Petrarch's "first labors [*labores*]" seem passive, puny, even unconscious as he asks, "where [*quo*] am I being led, forgetful of my purpose?" (8/245–46). *Labores* anticipates his acts of writing in a cramped room, but it also resumes the birth pangs, "with so much labor undergone by my mother [*matris labore*] and with so much danger that she was considered dead" (8/245). Now, as Petrarch describes his family's westward migration to Avignon, he constructs for himself a feminized self-image that evokes Virgil's Camilla (*Aeneid* 11.552–55) wrapped in a bundle and suspended on a rod "just as Metabus had done with Camilla" (8/245). This confused, shifting, transgendered identity marks off no social, cultural, or political site for masculine action. And yet, while Petrarch's labors extend beyond Cicero's res publica, the literary fragments that describe them originate "among the manly [*virili*] portions of the remains" (5/243).

Petrarch's efforts to recuperate his masculine public identity prompt him to represent his life as a martial engagement, "not only like military service [*militia*] but like actual warfare [*pugna*]" (8–9/246). They also prompt him to represent his writing as a battleground of ideas "in constant contradiction [*pugnantia*]." The act of writing compels him into "a double labor [*geminus labor*]" in which he charges others "first to consider to whom you have undertaken to write, and then what his state of mind [*affectus*] will be" (9/246), evoking the reciprocal exchange of the Gemini constellation's Pollux and Castor as the writer becomes the reader's twin, and vice versa. One result is an apparent loss of identity in Petrarch's tendency "to be very inconsistent [*differre*]" as he addresses his readers' various concerns (9/247).[10] From those unable to accept

contradiction, Petrarch counsels his accomplices to conceal variant texts "lest readers become upset at changes [*verborum mutatione*] I have made in the content or in the style" (10/247). His labor becomes an act of deformity as it seeks to avert factious responses in a makeshift space of social, cultural, and political exchange.[11]

"For me writing and living are the same thing" (13/250), Petrarch concludes, proclaiming his survival after the Black Death but also his will to literary immortality. From a hemmed-in site of temporal loss Petrarch has moved forward to a threshold of advantage in the belief that if he "were ever to enjoy a steady abode [*stabilis sedes*]" he would weave through his writing "a more noble and certainly a unified web or tapestry [*nobiliorem et certe uniformem telam*]." At the time of his writing in 1350 Petrarch had not yet attained his "steady abode." He was in fact on the verge of renouncing the greatest stability he had ever known at his retreat in Vaucluse and would not settle at Arquà until 1370, four years before his death. He has nonetheless succeeded in producing a body of texts "with multi-colored threads [*diversicoloribus liciis texta*]," and he promises to accomplish as much or more in the approaching future (14/251). The lack of an Italian home may unwittingly have generated positive results. Precisely because Petrarch has addressed his readers from multiple perspectives in different localities, he has found himself projecting a deeply resonant transnational voice with profound consequences for a later readership.

Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentators, for example, would try to smooth out Petrarch's inconsistencies in his regional relationships with the Visconti rulers of Milan and Francesco Carrara of Padua.[12] Depending upon their provenance or patronal affiliation, these commentators would represent Petrarch as either friendly or reserved toward such lords.[13] In reply to a hostile letter of 1344 by Brizio Visconti, the belligerent son of the coruler Luchino, in which the former disparages the art of poetry, Petrarch wrote his *Metrical Epistles* 1.10 and 2.17. Here he condemns Brizio's avarice, stupidity, and selfish indulgences, which Viscontian wealth has made possible. By 23 August 1353, however, Petrarch is thanking the ruler, Archbishop Galeazzo Visconti, for his gifts of "leisure and solitude [*solitudinem et otium*]" made available at a house near Sant'Ambrogio in Milan: "You certainly know my ways [*morem*]: I refresh my mind, wearied by affairs, through a change of location [*locorum alternatione*]" (*Fam.* 16.11: 2.318/907). Fifteenth-century commentators writing under the patronage of the later Visconti in northern Italy would elaborate upon Petrarch's indebtedness to Galeazzo in their reading of his life and works. Francesco Filelfo, producing his commentary in direct service to Duke Filippo

Maria Visconti in 1448, relies upon Antonio da Tempo's pro-Visconti biography of Petrarch written in the 1420s, with its account of the poet's residence (1353–61) at Milan and Pavia, "la quale città molto suole collaudare, dicendo nelle sue epistole in niuna avere trovato migliore abitazione" 'a city that he used to praise greatly, saying in his letters that nowhere had he found a better home' (Aiiii^{v}).[14]

Petrarch's changing attitudes toward earlier authors strike deeper chords. The offense that Petrarch took upon reading Cicero's querulous letters to Atticus is one example. Others seem more arbitrary, such as his contradictory evaluations of Dante and the Italian vernacular.[15] In a letter to Boccaccio written in 1359 Petrarch belittles his predecessor as a popular poet "who devoted his entire life to those things that were only the flower and first fruits of my youth" (*Fam.* 21.15: 3.205), though he grudgingly admits that Dante is "doubtless noble for his theme" (3.202). Petrarch couches his evaluation in spatial figurations, acknowledging that, for Boccaccio, Dante's example "afforded you ardor and light for this pathway [*in hoc calle*] that you have been treading with giant steps toward a glorious goal [*finem*]" (3.202/1128). Dante remained admirably steadfast amid the displacements of exile, since "nothing diverted him from his course [*calle*] once he had embarked upon it" (3.203/1129). Yet Petrarch declines to mention Dante's proper name in this letter.

Petrarch moreover boasts that he has never owned a copy of Dante's poetry despite its "easy availability" (3.203). The reason he alleges is that "were I to immerse myself [*imbuerer*] in his or any other's writings . . . I could scarcely escape becoming an unwilling or unconscious imitator." It is as though Dante's Italian writing were an ocean or abyss in which Petrarch could lose himself. Instead, he charts a space for his own originality, attributing any echoes to "pure chance or similarity of mind." At the same time he insists that he has explored Dante's terrain better than other readers whose "pathways of intelligence are closed [*obstructis*]" (3.204/1130). Such "illiterates in the taverns and squares [*ydiotas in tabernis et in foro*]" Petrarch wishes to avoid. He nonetheless knows that his youthful *rime* have attracted a wide following, and, in an allusion to the insults exchanged between poet-shepherds in Virgil's *Eclogues,* he bitterly regrets (or at least professes to regret) that "each day as I stroll, reluctantly and angry at myself, through the arcades [*in porticibus*], I find scores of ignoramuses everywhere [*ubique*] and some Dametas of my own at the street corners [*in triviis*]" ready to "strident miserum stipula disperdere carnem" 'ruin my poor song with a screeching reed' " (3.105/1131).[16] The verse quoted from *Eclogues* 3.27 draws the ancient poet into conflict with Dante as Petrarch re-

futes critics who question his own patriotism: "If they believe that a Mantuan [Virgil] is dearer to me than a Florentine [Dante], the fact remains that origin by itself [*origo per se ipsam*] without any other factor is not sufficient reason for esteem." The accident of his birth in the same locale as Dante's may in fact strain Petrarch's allegiance to his *patria*, since "envy flourishes more vigorously among neighbors [*inter vicinos*]" (3.206/1132). The shared site of their ancestry becomes a ground for rivalry and competition, disputed loyalties and ruptured affiliations.[17]

Pressed to admit another rivalry that he hoped others might notice, Petrarch would have cited his relationship with Virgil. Until at least 1349 Petrarch regarded his Latin epic *Africa* as his most important project, designed to equal the *Aeneid:* "I seem to shudder at my boldness and at the great framework I laid" (*Fam.* 8.3: 1.399/565).[18] Ever since initiating it in 1338, however, he complained of distractions. Not the least was his preoccupation with Laura. Already on 21 December 1336 (*Fam.* 2.9) he had replied to the ironic reproaches of Giacomo Colonna, bishop of Lombez, about her. The letter deals humorously with Petrarch's hopes, desires, plans, and intellectual pretensions, but its light touch invites serious questions. Colonna has evidently accused the poet of misleading his friends with invented fictions ("You maintain that many people have held magnificent opinions about me because of my inventiveness [*fictionibus meis*]") and of preferring ancient pagan deceit to Christian truth ("that I have embraced Augustine and his books with a certain amount of feigned [*simulata*] good will, but in truth have not torn myself away from the poets and philosophers") (1.99/326). Among the fictions that Colonna cites is Petrarch's love for Laura, a figure so "completely invented [*manufacta*]" that his poems are wholly "fictitious [*ficta*]" and his "sighs feigned [*simulata*]" (1.102/329).[19] Among the fictions that the poet defends is the story of Scipio, the hero of *Africa* and a sufficient reason for Petrarch to want to visit "the city of Rome where Scipio . . . triumphed in glory" (1.103). Present duties and "the will of others" delay his journey and heighten his wish to abandon "the restless anxieties" at Avignon (1.104). Rome now displaces Avignon in the writer's imagination even as the geographical site of Vaucluse claims his physical presence. Dreams displace reality, and history gives way to fiction.

The letter's elaborate structure barely conceals its linguistic preoccupation with two words, *amor* and *Roma.* It concludes with Petrarch's admission of friendship with Colonna, playing on punning associations of his name Petrarca with *petra* (stone) and on the idea of their friendship as a higher form of love: "I am not so insensitive [*saxeus* (stony)] that I must have someone incite

me to so generous and so worthy a love [*amor*]" (1.105/331). But elsewhere the letter catalogs the writer's other experiences of love: for transitory and fleeting fame but also for elevated poetry and philosophy; for Augustine and the Christian saints but also for Cicero and Seneca; for Laura and poetic fiction but also for Scipio and poetic history; for the site (*locum*) of Rome as a birthplace of national greatness but also for the sight (*aspectum*) of Rome, a Christian city and "an image of heaven on earth [*celi instar in terris,* with the concrete sense of instantiating the one in the other]" (1.104/331). With regard to his writing Petrarch mentions "the theatricality [*scenam*] of my achievement" quite literally as "the stage setting of my mind laid bare," a site exposed by Colonna's attentive reading of the text and of Petrarch as "a magician with mere words" (1.103).[20]

And the magic word is *amor.* Just as love for Laura distracts him from important tasks, so it may be his reason for remaining in France this winter of 1336–37.[21] It prevents him from reaching Colonna's Rome, both the real city "that has never been equaled nor ever will be" but also the imagined city "about which I read infinite things and have written many and shall perhaps write even more" (1.103–4). And just as his vernacular poetry will reveal his *amor* for Laura to be part of a continuum embracing *amor* for others human and divine, so may the magic of this poetry reveal that the palindromic inversion of *amor* spells *Roma,* a boustrephedon asserted in antiquity and one that I contend gives a powerful resonance to the *Rime sparse.*[22] The love that prompts Petrarch is a love for Laura and all that the sound of her name may signify: the laurels of poetry, transnational fame, and earthly glory; but also all that the letters of an inverted *amor* might signify: *Roma,* the city of history, ancient greatness, and Christian witness, its Republican heritage and Imperial rule, the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, cultural achievement and Italian prestige.[23] The very site of *amor* proclaims the sight of *Roma,* while the site of Rome can only challenge, undo, reinstate, or comply with the sight of his Love.

Petrarch's Coronation Oration, composed upon his crowning with laurel at Rome in 1341, displays a similar preoccupation. The event takes place at the site of ancient ceremonies "in this very Roman Capitol where we now are gathered" (1245).[24] Petrarch celebrates the power of *Roma* as a historical locale. But he also celebrates the power of love, *amor,* which has impelled him to go to Rome to receive the laurel.[25] The oration begins with a quotation from Virgil repeated four times throughout the discourse: "Sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis / raptat amor" 'But a sweet longing takes me on upward over the lonely slopes of Parnassus' (*Georgics* 3.291–92). In the Oration *Amor* motivates

the poet's "eagerness of a studious mind" willing to "take on [*raptat*]" a difficult task.[26] For both Virgil and Petrarch the Latin verb *raptat* conveys a primal, irresistible, violent sort of energy. Petrarch tries to harness this force by citing Marcus Varro, the ancient lexicographer, inventive etymologist of words, and indefatigable decoder of anagrams and words within words, for describing poetry as an "energy within the mind" and a "divine inbreathing" (1243). The link between this energy and *amor* occurs in the *Georgics* in which Virgil analogously refers to the renewal in springtime of sexual powers among beasts and humankind, prompting shepherds to mate their flocks and urging poets to sublimate eros in verse composition.[27] Here Petrarch quotes Virgil again, "Labor omnia vincit" 'toil overcomes all difficulties' (*Georgics* 1.145).

The site of Rome draws Petrarch's meditation on *amor* and *labor* into yet another orbit congruent with cultural history and political activity. Recalling a competing invitation from scholastic Paris to receive the laurel there, Petrarch attributes his choice to visit classical Rome as the outcome of a patriotic emotional attachment.[28] Citing Virgil's text, "Vincet amor patriae" 'Love of his fatherland will conquer' (*Aeneid* 6.823), he curiously mangles the original by transforming Virgil's future *vincet* (will conquer) into his own past *vicit* (has conquered). Virgil is recounting Anchises' prophecy in the underworld, necessitating the future tense, and one might argue that Petrarch's adjustment merely fits his own past narrative. Still, Anchises foretells the agonizing decision of Junius Brutus at the beginning of the ancient Roman Republic to condemn his own sons for trying to restore Tarquin's monarchy.[29] The conflict between republican and monarchical values reaches its violent resolution in Anchises' narrative, only to be overturned during Virgil's Augustan age by Rome's reversion to imperial rule.

In Petrarch's epoch a series of crises sought resolution not only in the contest between the papacy and the empire but also in the rise of despotic local rule, in the conflict between feudal aristocracy and urban bourgeoisie, and in a renewed form of republican government at Rome led by Cola di Rienzo, whom Petrarch would support even to the detriment of his earlier patrons in the aristocratic Colonna family.[30] Petrarch found his way through these crises, I contend, with an emphasis on personal allegiances to the extent that these allegiances mobilized his expressed political sentiments. The problem of an unresolved future nonetheless complicates the oration's reference to several possible sites with Petrarch's wish "to bring some glory to this city, to the city whence I came, and to all Italy" (1245). The first site, "this city," implies Rome, but which incarnation of Rome does Petrarch mean: the ancient republic? the

capital of the empire? the seat of the papacy? the medieval city governed by contentious nobles? The second site, "the city whence I came," may imply his ancestral Florence, a republic now in disarray; or Avignon, the papal residence controlled by a foreign monarch; or Naples, where he has just been examined by King Robert, himself an ideological foe of the Holy Roman emperor Louis IV of Bavaria. The third site, "Italy," evokes protonational sentiments, but of what precise sort and in what exact relation to republican city-states or a consolidated empire? To which of these competing centers and systems of government does the poet pledge himself?

The one relatively stable object of *amor* that Petrarch can claim without hesitation is the cultural patrimony of *Roma.* Here the laurel intervenes as both a promise and a fulfillment. Poets who deserve it have exercised the highest office of poetry, defined as the power of commuting historical truth through figurative understanding, "tak[ing] things that have really come to pass and transform[ing] them by means of subtle figures" (1246). Because such poets intervene upon national histories, their work complements that of rulers. As Petrarch proclaims, the laurel is a "due reward of Caesars and of poets" (1248), evoking the fragrance of a good reputation, a resting place after arduous labor, a preservative against corruption, an ornament of sacred institutions, and an emblem of eternal life. Poets share these honors with monarchs and imperial rulers because their poetry unites groups of people and promotes social relations. The conventional vehicle for such activity is the Latin epic, to which the newly crowned Petrarch aspires.[31]

Here the *Rime sparse* stand as testimony that Latin epic eluded Petrarch throughout his career. Their recurrent subtext evokes the author's deferral of his *Africa* to the fragments of his Italian songs and sonnets, his *rerum fragmenta vulgarium.* This topic incorporates echoes from Ovid's *Amores,* transposing them to a contest between Latin and the vernacular. In sonnet 3, "Era il giorno ch' al sol si scoloraro" 'It was the day when the sun's rays turned pale,' positioned as sonnet 2 in early editions of the *Rime sparse,* Petrarch's speaker complains that Cupid or Amor deserves no praise for having wounded him on Good Friday, without reciprocally wounding Laura:

> Però, al mio parer, non li fu honore
> ferir me de saetta in quello stato,
> a voi armata non mostrar pur l'arco.
>
> Therefore, as it seems to me, it got him no honor to strike me with an arrow in that state, and not even to show his bow to you, who were armed.

Likewise, Ovid's speaker complains in *Amores* 1.2 that Cupid has attacked him unarmed: "Nec tibi laus armis victus inermis ero" 'Nor will it be praise for thine arms to vanquish me unarmed' (1.2.22). Wounded, he hardly recovers.

The wound refers not to the beloved's immunity or sexual indifference but to the lover's preoccupation with writing poetry. He had, he explains at the beginning of *Amores* 1.1, set out to compose a Latin epic in dactylic hexameter before Cupid assailed him. Not only has Cupid diverted his attention to amatory matters, but the god has also robbed him of a metrical foot, evoking the truncated line of elegiac verse which alternates with dactylic hexameter and compromises Ovid's high style:

> Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
> edere, materia conveniente modis.
> par erat inferior versus—risisse Cupido
> dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.
> (*Amores* 1.1.1–4)[32]

> Arms, and the violent deeds of war, I was making ready to sound forth—in weighty numbers, with matter suited to the measure. The second verse was equal to the first—but Cupid, they say, with a laugh stole away one foot.

A parallel anxiety haunts Petrarch's speaker. *Africa* stands on hold as he turns his attention to Laura. Marking his descent from the ambitions of Latin epic, the scattered rhymes of Petrarch's Italian poetry constitute a scandal, a stumbling block on his route to poetic fame, a site of national failure.[33]

Repeatedly, Petrarch's speaker evokes this defective foot as a metonymic figure for the vernacular rhymes that have displaced classical meters in his writing. At times he wonders how his feet have sustained their burden: "Et che' pie' miei non son fiaccati et lassi / a seguir l'orme vostre in ogni parte" 'And that my feet are not worn and tired of following your footsteps everywhere' (74.9–10). He acknowledges that they cannot do otherwise: "Amor in altra parte non mi sprona, / né i pie' sanno altra via" 'Love does not spur me anywhere else, nor do my feet know any other road' (97.12–13). A "fera stella" 'cruel star' has presided upon the "fera terra ov' e' pie' mossi poi" 'cruel ground where I later set my feet' (174.4). And after Laura's death his poetic talent serves to no avail in reclaiming her: "Pie' miei, vostra ragion là non si stende / ov' è colei ch' esercitar vi sòle" 'My feet, your region / reason does not extend to where she is who used to make you work" (275.7–8; trans. mod.). Petrarch's final appeal enlists the defective Ovidian foot that long ago directed him to the site of love. Here he has suffered diverse torments ("diversi tormenti," with a possible pun on *di versi tormenti* [torments of verse]):

> E 'ncomincio: —Madonna, il manco piedo
> giovinetto pos' io nel costui regno,
> ond' altro ch' ira et sdegno
> non ebbi mai; et tanti et sì diversi
> tormenti ivi soffersi. (Canzone 360.9–13)

And I begin: "Lady, when I was young, I placed my left foot in his kingdom, whence I have never had anything but sorrow and scorn; and I have suffered there so many and such strange torments."

Against such odds the speaker has deferred *Africa* to the strangeness and variety of the *Rime sparse*.[34]

Curiously enough, *Africa* reaches its impasse on political rather than amatory grounds. Here Petrarch transfers his praise of republican Rome to an uneasy endorsement of Ghibelline imperialism. The poem glorifies Roman antiquity but also submits both the republican and the imperial institutions of Rome to trenchant critique.[35] In the end its political focus blurs, rendering its sympathies for or against republican or monarchical government indeterminate. Petrarch began his epic in 1338 or 1339, when Livy's celebratory history of the Roman Republic still exerted a profound and positive influence upon him. After 1353 he tried only sporadically to revise and finish the poem while serving the Visconti and Carrara lords and their northern imperial monarchism. *Africa* pays allegiance to both causes.[36] Laelius' discourse on early Roman history exalts republican *libertas* as an antidote to the tyranny of Rome's Etruscan kings: "Libertas optata diu nunquamve petita / Mulcebat splendore animos, sed sceptra premebant" 'The light of liberty, unrealized / but long held dear, shone in our hearts the while / a haughty sceptre held us all in thrall' (3.652–53/3.823–25).[37] Counterbalancing this discourse, however, the narrator's report of Scipio's exile discloses the destructive workings of envy, mob rule, and injustice in a republican government: "Ubi unquam / Gente pares animi totque adversantibus ulla?" 'Say where on earth is found / a nation [*gens*] with like spirit—and like foes' (8.571–72/8.816–17). Here the citizenry is a clueless rabble, a deformation of the public voice, an abomination.

Every credit exacts a debit. Near the beginning Scipio experiences a vision of the future which lauds Julius Caesar, antagonist of the republic, as "Fortissimus ille nepotem / Unus erit magno semper cantandus in orbe" 'the bravest of all Rome's sons [worthy to] be sung throughout the earth' (2.219–20/2.287) but which also criticizes him as intemperate in his use of force: "O felix si forte modium sciat addere ferro!" 'Ah, happy conqueror could he but learn / to set due limits on his flashing blade' (2.228/2.298–99). Likewise, Augustus ranks

high for inaugurating "tranquilla secula" 'centuries of peace' with imperial rule (2.254/2.335), but yet he scores low for bequeathing an era in which "video Romana reverti / Fata retro et pulcros prolabi ad turpia mores" 'I see the fates of Rome / reversed and all our ancient practices / once fair degenerate' (2.259–60/2.338–39). In the end Scipio can only postpone his vision of ideal rule to a remote future that "abscondit sub nube Deus" 'God enshrouds in mist' (2.298/2.389). Petrarch's hero then retreats into ambiguous silence, his judgment on the republic and the empire suspended.

So too does the epic narrator of *Africa.* At its conclusion Ennius, author of the hexameter *Annales* in the second century B.C.E., anticipates poets who will outdo him in *integumentum,* the veiling of truth with signifying figures, "sub ignoto tamen ut selentur amictu, / Nuda alibi, et tenui frustrentur lumina velo, / Interdumque palam veniant, fugiantque vicissim" 'disguised beneath / a covering cloak, or better, a light veil / which tricks the catcher's eye and now conceals / and now discloses underlying truth' (9.100–102/9.134–39).[38] Homer himself informs Ennius about Petrarch's efforts to win the laurel: "Francisco cui nomen erit; qui grandia facta, / Vidisti que cunta oculis, ceu corpus in unum / Colliget" 'He will be called Franciscus; / and all the glorious exploits you have seen / he will assemble in one volume" (9.232–34/9.318–20). The very laurel that Ennius wears matches Scipio's, so that the poet and the leader share the fame of victory and its commemoration in verse.

Petrarch had never read Plato's *Republic,* unavailable to him in any complete Latin translation, but from Cicero and Seneca he knew that Plato had banished the poets from his commonwealth.[39] Petrarch's *Metrical Epistle* 2.10 offers a curious interpretation. Plato separated the poets from ordinary citizens not for the citizens' good but for the well-being of the poets. He wanted to protect the poets by offering them sanctuary apart from the mob, a nurturing environment in which they might accomplish their best work, "adversos populi nos moribus, illum / moribus infestum nostris studioque futurum" 'knowing we poets would be alien / to habits of the masses, and the folk / intolerant of our manners and our zeal / for study' (2.10.178– 83).[40] Ultimately, the poets' exile to such a site benefits the state, for the work that they produce there defines its national goals and provides a basis for science and wisdom, learning and knowledge, history and community.

In the politically troubled years between 1346 and 1352, years that saw the deepening intransigence of the Avignon papacy, the death of King Robert of Naples, the rise and fall of Cola di Rienzo at Rome, the devastation of the Black Plague, and an intensification of the Hundred Years War between

France and England, Petrarch composed a series of twelve pastoral eclogues in Latin, the *Bucolicum carmen,* which reflects upon these events.[41] The first eclogue, a dialogue between Silvius (Petrarch) and Monicus (his brother Gherardo, a Carthusian monk) explores the respective merits of a worldly and a cloistered life. To Monicus' question about what motivates his painful exertion "per deserta vagari / Muscososque situ scopulos fontesque sonantes" 'to wander through desert wastelands, / Over moss-covered crags or where lonely cataracts thunder' (1.9–10), Silvius answers, "Hei michi! Solus Amor" 'Love 'tis, alas, only love' (1.11). His love is, of course, a love for song, but when Monicus-Gherardo invites him to sing David's Psalms in the monastery, Silvius-Petrarch declines by avowing that his songs should be secular and historical in the classical manner, evoking the palindromic *Roma* and *amor:* "Hi Romam Troiamque canunt . . . / Quid dolor et quid amor possit" 'My masters sing of great Rome and of Troy . . . telling of love and its power' (1.75–76). In eclogue 3 the shepherd Stupeus (Petrarch) pursues Daphne (Laura), a transparent figure for poetic composition as well as for the poet's human beloved. Daphne leads him to the Capitoline Hill, where she reveals the glories of Rome and his historical patrimony, "viridi lauro" 'with a wreath of laurel encircled' (3.158). The wreath rewards the poet for art as well as love; both are braided in its leaves.

The speaker's identification with Rome deepens in later eclogues. In eclogue 4 Gallus, a pastoral figure for French culture and its national politics, would purchase an Italian lyre to import song into his native land. His interlocutor, Tyrhennus, a figure for the patrimony of Italian culture, argues that music belongs to Italy and cannot be hauled abroad: "Citharamque relinque; / Est quibus a teneris tractata suaviter annis" 'Leave the lyre to its rightful owners, those who from tender years have drawn from its strings sweet music' (4.68–69). In eclogue 8 the shepherd Amyclas (Petrarch) bids farewell to his friend Ganymede (Giovanni Colonna), allegorizing Petrarch's painful rupture with Colonna after Cola di Rienzo's war on the Roman barons in 1347. Amyclas cites the compulsion of his *amor patriae,* evoking Virgil's pathos, though not exactly the agonizing context of Junius Brutus' commitment to the emerging republic in *Aeneid* 6.823: "Agnosco validum patrie revocantis amorem" 'Yonder I feel the love of my country calling me homeward' (8.56). In response to Ganymede's questions, he adduces personal, political, and poetic goals summarized in the word *principia* (origins), including those inscribed in ancient textual sources: "Levis est ad prima recursus / Principia" 'Going back to my sources cannot but bring me / Happiness' (8.85–86). In eclogue 10 he finally travels to Rome, where his favorite poets, Virgil among them, sit on the Capi-

toline crowned in laurel: "Celsoque virens in vertice laurus / Admonuit nostre" 'High on that lofty summit a laurel, fresh in its greening, / Made me remember my own' (10.282–83). The younger poet can now construct his supraregional identity as an Italian inheritor of Roman culture precisely because he has journeyed in time to the classical past and has discovered there a site of achievement that he can relate to.

This journey has disclosed a movable, itinerant Rome, one implicated in the transmission of culture but not at all stabilized or fully recoverable at any single time or narrowly circumscribed place. To Petrarch it came to seem least recoverable upon the particular site of Rome in his own time. This lesson he may have learned from St. Augustine, who, after the Goths had sacked the ancient capital in 410, dismissed reports of harm to the city by proclaiming that the true *civitas* consists of citizens, not walls.[42] The concrete materiality of Rome cedes to the abstract idea of a city unbound to its physical location: Rome need no longer be in Rome. Petrarch's relationship to the city as the site of his coronation in 1341, as the ancestral domain of his later estranged Colonna patrons, as the stage of Cola di Rienzo's abortive effort to establish a limited constitutional republic in 1347, and as the potentially renewed seat of imperial power under Emperor Charles IV, whose coronation at Rome in 1355 the poet supported, welcomes all these multiple meanings. Still, while Petrarch allowed himself to grow increasingly comfortable with patronage from the Visconti, Francesco da Carrara, Azzo da Correggio, and other northern Italian lords after 1353, he hesitated fully to detach Rome's mobile symbolic life from its physical space. His alternate embrace and abandonment of Rome become comprehensible in this light as an unflagging effort to assert the sentimental claims of a specific place, a topographical location, a geopolitical site, to stand synecdochally for a larger whole.

2 *Petrarchan Totems and Political Taboos*

Petrarch's ambivalent attitude toward Rome as both a mental construction and a geographical site finds a forceful expression in *Familiares* 15.3, written at Vaucluse in February 1353, a few months before his final departure for Italy. An irresistible urge to leave southern France had seized him, despite reports that it would not be safe or wise to do so.[1] On the verge of reclaiming his Italian identity yet forced to remain in Provence, Petrarch writes that physical location seems immaterial: Vaucluse embraces Rome and Athens as a site where he may best communicate with his friends and ancient writers.[2] Here I have established my Rome, my Athens, and my spiritual fatherland [*patriam*]; here I gather all the friends I have or did have . . . from every land and every age in this narrow valley, conversing with them more willingly than with those who think they are alive because they see traces of their stale breath in the frosty air (2.256–57/844–45). Even as he writes, however, he seems ready to leave Vaucluse, his spiritual fatherland, to possess the soil of Italy, the land of his mother tongue.

Petrarch's attitude toward Florence, the birthplace of his forefathers, is likewise ambivalent. Although its literary language fuels his *Rime sparse,* the city of his parentage represents strife-torn factionalism. It has conferred upon him an exilic identity that he now wishes to redeem from its Guelph victors, who had driven out his father. Related to Florence by a bond of culture and ancestry, he nonetheless shuns it because of the crime it has committed against his family. It acquires totemic status as a figure of ancestral origin from which he might have expected to receive care and protection but has instead suffered

deep pain. Hostile toward it, fearful of it, he displaces his unappeased longings on to other sites in northern Italy.

In *Totem and Taboo* Freud describes such ambivalence, the simultaneous existence of love and hate toward the same paternal object, as matter for a social psychology focused on the interplay of religion, art, law, and other social and cultural institutions that arise from it. A sense of remorse from having felt antipathy toward this figure of origin generates a "deferred obedience" with creative and socially integrative consequences (13.143). The survivors of an ancestral violence who once banded together to subdue the latter now become rivals to acquire its power and patrimony. In order to avert a zero-sum struggle for possession, they have no choice but to agree upon a system for factoring its inheritance. Establishing a prohibition on such sexual practices as incest and wife stashing which confuse paternal bloodlines and inflame household rivalries, they form a fraternal clan linked by exogamic blood ties and economic alliances. The basis for their social and political reorganization rests upon sexual taboos.

In coming to terms with the conditions of his exile, Petrarch targeted his attention to compensatory sites in northern Italy. What he did not expect was the degree of internecine strife and fraternal rivalry that he found there. Conflicts between Guelphs and Ghibellines had racked most of the area, but by 1277 the Visconti family had come to power in Milan, and within a few generations it controlled Lombardy.[3] The aftermath of the Black Death in the mid-fourteenth century brought great unrest throughout Italy, notably in Cola di Rienzo's renewed disturbances at Rome and in a war between Venice and Genoa which broke out in 1352.[4] Still, Petrarch took his permanent departure from Vaucluse for Italy in late May 1353. He well knew that Giovanni Visconti's aspirations to dynastic absolutism in Milan represented the antithesis of republican liberty prized at least by lip service in Florence, but he assented to Viscontian sovereignty in exchange for patronage. At least some of his bad faith in having done so emerges in the confessional *Secretum*.[5] Other indications emerge in his collected letters.

In *Familiares* 17.10, dated 1 January 1354, Petrarch recounts the struggle within his conscience, "the monstrousness [*monstrum*] of my spirit," in terms of a Pauline depravity of will and Augustinian perplexity of desire, "that I may not want wholly what I wish in part and, unless I am mistaken, what I desire to will fully" (3.34/954).[6] The letter resonates with Petrarch's awareness of compromising his *libertas*. The word certainly implies the writer's professional free-

dom to devote himself to his literary career but also the political freedom that writers endanger when they attach themselves to despotic patrons. This *libertas* was embodied for Petrarch, Dante, and Boccaccio in the ideals of an ancient Roman Republic, now prey to the aggressive designs of northern lords who serve as vicars of a reconstituted empire: "Even in fetters, if fortune condemns me to them, I continue thinking of liberty [*libertatis*], and amid the cities I continue thinking of the country" (3.35/955). Having already settled in Milan when he wrote this letter, Petrarch concluded that Viscontian economic support was worth the compromise.[7]

Italy had acquired a naturalized value in Petrarch's imagination. It represented not so much a genetic patrimony as a cultural inheritance to be passed on and protected, especially the latter, because civil disputes and fraternal rivalries were threatening to annihilate it. The violence of war and stupidity of local despots had depleted its reserves. Petrarch aimed to restore a historical consciousness that would effect change in human relations and would help to resolve antagonisms that divided communities.[8] If human beings are to coexist and thrive as autonomous agents, they have no alternative but to impose restraints upon their desires and institute laws against the unbridled force of might. And, if sexual taboos form a basis for social and political regulation, then sexual restraint may serve as a psychic emblem for this development. In the *Rime sparse* Petrarch's tempering of his desires for Laura provides such an emblem, so that the sublimation of libidinal drives becomes a conspicuous feature of social, cultural, political, and economic progress. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentators on the poetry interpret the implications of this scenario from widely varying regional perspectives.

Petrarch's fifteenth-century Visconti apologists, Antonio da Tempo (1420s), Francesco Filelfo (1445–47), and Hieronimo Squarzafico (1484), for example, repeatedly massage the implied narrative of the *Rime sparse* until it appears complimentary to Milan and its tyrannical leaders at the expense of Florence and republican ideals.[9] Petrarch renounces his psychic allegiance to Tuscany and even to Laura, and he directs it instead to a displaced Visconti and Milanese paternalism. Filelfo's commentary gives a typical twist to the famous sonnet 16, "Movesi il vecchierel canuto et bianco" 'The little white-haired pale old man moves,' usually understood in the context of Petrarch's 1337 journey to Rome.[10] In Filelfo's account Petrarch has stopped at Milan en route to Rome, and the charms of Milanese women offer the poet a standard of comparison to Laura:

> Era il petrarcha gia in Italia gionto e fermatosi qui in Milano al tempo della felice memoria di magnanimo principe Messer Galeazo uesconte inclyto signor de Milano dalla cui excellentissima sublimita lui fu ben ueduto e molto honorato. Il perche da questa illustrissima cita abondatissima semper stata come hoggi anchor uedemo di bellissime donne. Il presente sexto decimo sonetto scripse allamata sua madonna Laura. (22v)
>
> Petrarch had already arrived in Italy and had stopped here in Milan at the happily remembered time of our great prince, Galeazzo Visconti, lord of Milan, by whose most excellent highness he had been well received and much honored; because this most illustrious city has always been most lavishly endowed with the most beautiful ladies, as we still see today. He wrote this sixteenth sonnet to his beloved.

In sonnet 98, "Orso, al vostro destrier si po ben porre" 'Orso, on your charger can be put,' Filelfo wastes no opportunity to defame Florence. The poem consoles the Roman nobleman Orso dell'Anguillara for having been prevented from participating in a local tournament. Filelfo uses the occasion to recount an incident concerning Pandolfo Malatesta, lord of Rimini.[11] In Filelfo's narrative Galeazzo Visconti has invited Pandolfo to join his service as military commander, but Pandolfo must first obtain release from the Florentine *balìa,* to which he has pledged his support. The Florentines rudely refuse this request because "sempre alla illustrissima e triomphal casa di Vesconti furon pocho amici: & hora son men che mai come quei channo grandissima suspitione di non perdere il loro stato tyrannico chiamato liberta" 'they were always unfriendly to the most illustrious house of the Visconti, and now are less friendly than ever as they are wholly paranoiac about losing their tyrannical state, which they call "liberty"' (102v). When Pandolfo leaves Florence without this permission, the Milanese congratulate themselves for being more attractive to him than the Florentines.

Filelfo's manipulations occasion piquant digressions and gratuitous distortions. In sonnet 8, a highly mannered greeting that accompanies a gift of fowl to an unnamed friend, Filelfo conjectures that the animal might be a partridge. He then remarks parenthetically that, because Leonardo Aretino referred to two Florentine homosexuals as "old partridges," we should disparage Florence for tolerating such vice: "E messer Leonardo aretino huomo doctissimo soleua chiamare Nicolao nicoli da Pistoia. e poggio bambalione da terra nuova iuechi pernicioni. . . . Il che di lor dui per tutta firenze cum grande infamia susaua publicamente parlare" 'The most learned Leonardo Aretino used to call Nicolao Nicoli of Pistoia and Poggio Bambalione from the provinces

the old partridges. . . . This gossip about them was whispered publicly throughout Florence with great infamy' (11v).[12] In sonnet 78, a poem honoring Simone Martini for his portrait of Laura, Filelfo again refers to the same Poggio. Here he bathetically juxtaposes the poem's reference to Pygmalion with Poggio's account of a masturbatory fantasy: "Ma ne etiandio parlargli: ueduta una imagine de legno ingessata: in cui la figura e similitudine di quella fanciulla mirabilmente si representaua: non una uolta ma piu di cento quella carnalmente hebbe ad usare" 'He said he had seen a figure of plastered wood in which the image and likeness of a young girl was wonderfully represented; not once, but more than a hundred times he had carnal relations with it' (91r). Filelfo concludes that such psychosexual depravity could take place only in Florence.

Filelfo's most striking manipulations concern poems that ostensibly represent Petrarch's love for Laura but which allow amatory and erotic motifs to blur into social and political commentary. Even submerged references to Laura provide Filelfo with political themes glorifying Milan and the Visconti. Sonnet 10, for example, an address to Stephano Colonna from the estate in Gascony of his son Giacomo, honors the family's moral leadership: "Gloriosa Columna in cui s'appoggia / nostra speranza e 'l gran nome latino" 'Glorious column on whom rests our hope and the great renown of Latium.'[13] Filelfo explains that even without mentioning Laura the poem recalls the ennobling effects of love upon a poet who serves patrons like the Colonna and Visconti: "Il precedente decimo sonetto: quantunque non paia hauer conformita cum la precedente materia amorosa non e perho da quella alieno: inquanto glinnamorati uolentieri cercano luoghi solitarii & dilecteuoli per poter senza meno impaccio usare il loro pensieri & fantasia" 'However much it appears not to conform to the preceding amatory material, this tenth sonnet is nonetheless not alien from it insofar as lovers willingly seek out remote and pleasant places in order to be able to exercise their thoughts and imaginations without impediment' (13r). Petrarch's visit to Gascony allows him to return refreshed to his duties in the world of political action. From a group of three occasional sonnets addressed to close friends, Filelfo extracts the poet's anti-Florentine sentiments. Sonnet 67 recounts to one friend his distraction as he falls into a stream while journeying toward Italy. Sonnet 68 records for another his determination to live a better life as he approaches "l'aspetto sacro de la terra vostra" 'the holy sight of your city.' Sonnet 69 describes for a third his unsuccessful attempt to escape from Love's influence.

For Filelfo these poems evoke a precise geographical site. The speaker is en-

tering his ancestral Florence, here figured by its totemic "aspetto sacro" 'sacred aspect' (sonnet 68), which other commentators had identified with Rome.[14] In Filelfo's view their single addressee is Boccaccio, who has recently encouraged Petrarch to return to the land of his forefathers: "Nel presente soneto quinquagesimo quinto risponde messer Francescho Petrarcha a Messer Giobanni boccacio: Il quale poi che gia era stato ribandito doue prima era ribello insieme cum Ser Petrarcho notaio apostolico suo padre: il confortaua che uolesse tornare a firenze" 'In the present fifty-fifth sonnet Petrarch responds to Giovanni Boccaccio, since the poet had already been banished when he was proclaimed a rebel with his father Ser Petracco, an apostolic notary. Boccaccio had given solace to Petrarch when he asked him to return to Florence.' Fearing the consequences of political factionalism, Petrarch declines Boccaccio's invitation with the excuse that he must return to Avignon because he pines for Laura: "Il che lui non uolendo fare: per la spesse turbatione & inuidie la quella citta gli manifesta sotto piaceuol parlare che non ne uole fare nulla: assegnando una leggiadra cagione: cioe il uolere ritornare in auignone a uedere madonna Laura. Il che non fe perho" 'Not wishing to do so because of that city's frequent turmoil and envy, he instead remonstrated with pleasing words that he would not remain there by adducing a graceful excuse: namely his preferences to return to Avignon to see Laura, which in any case he did not do' (79^{v}). Literature suffers a loss because of Florentine belligerence and Petrarch's love for Laura.

Filelfo neglects to mention that this narrative violates chronology, since Petrarch did not meet Boccaccio until 1350, two years after Laura's death.[15] Still, the commentator's invention allows for a dramatic moment in which Petrarch chooses between pious affection for his father's homeland and a burning desire for Laura in southern France: "Mostra lui esser combattuto da questo duo pensieri dello andare a firenze: doue secondo il confortare del boccacio harebbe acquistato grande honore e gloria. E del tornare in auignone" 'It shows him besieged by two thoughts, whether to go to Florence, where according to Boccaccio's encouragement he would have acquired great honor and glory, or to return to Avignon.' In the end he chooses Avignon over Florence, affirming a commitment to Laura and papal service over the hypocrisy of Florentine politics. For Filelfo the choice is right because Petrarch was not really Florentine after all: "Nel uero Messer Francesco: non fu fiorentino: ma da lancisa: che del contato darezzio" 'In truth Petrarch was not Florentine but came from Incisa in the domain of Arezzo' (79^{v}). Born in exile after Guelph compatriots ejected his father, he would eventually find northern Italy more hospitable. The dominant motif in Filelfo's analysis of Petrarch's poetry, then,

is passion. The speaker's love for Laura represents one form of it, but his evolving love for *patria* represents another. Contending definitions of *patria* nonetheless trouble him, whether evoking his ancestors' origins in Florence, his birthplace near Arezzo, his adoptive residence in northern Italy, or his hopes for a renewed site of power in Rome.[16]

Filelfo vividly associates amatory devotion with patriotic fervor in a group of four poems that appear to ignore Laura. The first two, sonnets 25 and 26, address a male friend who has overcome debilitating passions, while sonnets 27 and 28 celebrate the effort of European rulers to overcome their political differences as they direct their energies to a crusade in the Holy Land.[17] Among these poems Filelfo understands sonnets 25 and 26 as urging preparation and purgation before undertaking more exalted work. He speculates that the addressee of both sonnets is Cino da Pistoia: "Dice che amore & ancor lui insieme mirando che la sua anima era disciolta e libera da legami corporei" 'The poet says that both he and Love marvel that his soul had been released and freed from corporeal bonds' (39^{r}).[18] The *legami* (bonds) to which Petrarch refers include Cino's political allegiance to Tuscany. Consequently, Filelfo comments upon sonnet 26: "Lamore della patria hauer forza grandissima niuno e che non intenda. Et ancho il petrarca assai perho che essendo luy ribello & discacciato insieme cum suo patre nominato Ser Petrarca da lancisa: quantunque male contento fusse da suoi citadini: non perho si trouo mai contra la patria ne sallegno dalchuna adversita di quella" 'There is no one who does not understand that love of one's fatherland is extremely potent; and especially Petrarch, since he was a rebel and an exile together with his father from Incisa; but however unhappy he was with its citizens, he was never hostile to his fatherland, nor did he take pleasure in any adversity against it' (39^{v}).

In Filelfo's view Petrarch's praise of Cino for having returned "al dritto camin" 'to the right path' implies that he is tempering his own impulses and moderating his own desires, both amatory and political. Despite his hostile attitude toward Florence, Filelfo concedes that even the fractious citizens of that republic appear capable of transformation, "secondo quel prouerbio: che dice. Firenze non muoue se tutta non duole" 'according to the proverb that Florence is not moved to action unless all its citizens suffer' (40^{r}). The commentator's animus feeds upon regional rivalries that inhibited pan-Italian national sentiment for centuries. The product of a courtly patronage system, Filelfo exalted the factional claims of his lord rather than the bonds linking him to others.[19] Firm in his allegiance to current benefaction, he nonetheless shifted allegiance when it profited him. After vilifying Florence when he served the Visconti, he

accepted an offer from Lorenzo de' Medici in 1481, moved to Florence, and died there celebrating the republic. With cultural voices such as Filelfo, Italy needed no enemies to impede its political unity.

Alessandro Vellutello likewise devotes much of his commentary to exploring figurative links between Petrarch's libidinal drives and his supraregional political attachments. A native of Lucca, erstwhile friend of Bembo, and resourceful editor at the press of Giovanni Antonio da Sabbio at Venice, Vellutello rearranges the sequence of the *Rime sparse* to parallel events in Petrarch's life.[20] His edition of *Il Petrarcha* (1525) separates from the amatory poetry a body of nonamatory poems, regrouping the latter as a new sequence of thirty-four sonnets and three canzoni. These poems constitute a *terza parte* that follows upon the *prima parte* of poems *in vita de M. Laura* and the *seconda parte* of poems *in morte di M. Laura*.[21] Among them, thirty address specific male audiences. Eight concern general matters of friendship, such as comfort in affliction and advice to pursue worthy goals (sonnets 8, 139, 98, 99, 158, 120, 232, and 244 in that order). Nine explore political issues associated with the Babylonian papacy in Avignon and factional strife in Italy (canzone 128; sonnets 114, 136–38, 103; canzone 53; sonnet 27; and canzone 28). Three convey amatory advice to friends who lament their beloved's cruelty (sonnets 179, 25, and 91). Ten focus on literary issues that the speaker vents with potential patrons or other poets (sonnets 10, 7, 24, 166, 104, 322, 26, 92, 40, and 287). Here the instinctual rivalries that destroy many communities are overcome in acts of sublimation and patriotic accord.

Many poems in this last group acknowledge personal debts. In sonnet 10, for example, Petrarch thanks Giacomo Colonna for hospitality at his estate in the foothills of the Pyrenees, "onde si scende poetando et poggia" 'where we climb up and down poetizing.' Vellutello comments that "quello non esser luogo frequentato dal vulgo, . . . ma da contemplanti & nobili spiriti, che la solitudine cercano" 'this is not a place frequented by the common populace, . . . but by contemplative and noble spirits who seek solitude' (175^{v}). Implied in Petrarch's praise is a request for continued patronage from Colonna, "Gloriosa Columna in cui s'appoggia / nostra speranza" 'Glorious Column on whom rests our hope.' According to Vellutello, the speaker renews this request in sonnet 104, "L'aspettata vertù che 'n voi fioriva" 'The hoped-for virtue that was flowering in you,' this time promising his warrior friend Pandolfo Malatesta "cosa onde 'l vostro nome in pregio saglia" 'something to increase your fame.' As Vellutello sees it, the speaker reminds Pandolfo that poetic praise endures longer than statues made of stone and should receive ample recompense:

"Hanno ad hauere piu obligo a quelli che di loro hanno scritto, che a quelli che li feron le statue, perche le statue sono andate per terra, & per le scritte charte sono & saranno anchora in luce" 'Patrons should be more obliged to those who have written about them than to those who would make statues of them, because statues have crumbled into the earth, but on written pages the subjects of verse will still remain as though alive' (185^{v}). In January 1372 Petrarch sent Pandolfo a nearly complete manuscript of his *Rime sparse* in thanks for an offer of shelter at Pesaro during a time of plague and warfare between Padua and Venice. It was the closest that he came to dedicating his Italian poetry to a single potential patron.[22]

Circumscribing his relationships with patrons and other poets is an implied narrative about Petrarch's conception of a goal and his frustrations upon attending it.[23] The speaker is beset by human interference and adverse fortune. Sonnet 322 laments the death of Giacomo Colonna. Vellutello explains that a malign planet has looked upon them: "Onde domanda da qual fero pianeta fossero insieme tanto inuidiati, che per la sua morte egli non potesse tal lauoro mostrarli" 'Whence he asks by what cruel planet they had both been envied so much that through the latter's death the former could not show him such work' (188^{r}). In sonnet 40 Petrarch politely asks an unnamed colleague, perhaps a fellow poet, to return a borrowed book that he needs to complete his own work, "un mio lavor sì doppio / tra lo stil de' moderni e 'l sermon prisco" 'a work so double between the style of the moderns and ancient speech.' According to Vellutello the book is one by "quel suo diletto padre Santo Augustino" 'his spiritual father, St. Augustine,' and the speaker's work is *De Remediis,* a "lavoro" doubly double because it concerns both good and bad fortune and is written in a style evoking both the ancients and the moderns, "essendo doppio il soggetto, perche dell'una e dell'altra fortuna trata, & anchora per introdurui (come dice) lo stile, cio è la dottrina de moderni, con quella de gli antichi" 'being double for the subject, because it treats of both kinds of fortune, and again for introducing (as he says) the style, i.e., the learning of the moderns with that of the ancients' (195^{r}). Here Petrarch's obsession with classical Latin style supersedes even his obsession with Laura.

In sonnet 166 Petrarch is vexed because he cannot complete his *Africa,* and according to Vellutello the reason for his distraction is not Laura but his responsibilities at court:

> S' i' fussi stato fermo a la spelunca
> là dove Apollo diventò profeta,
> Fiorenza avria forse oggi il suo poeta.

> If I had stayed in the cave where Apollo became a prophet, Florence would perhaps have her poet today.

The commentator explains that court politics and public life have interrupted Petrarch's literary production. He might have succeeded only "se egli fosse stato fermo alla sua habitatione di Valclusa, & non si fosse a seruigi del Pontifice, & a seguitar la corte condotto" 'if he had stayed at his residence in Vaucluse and had not been inducted into the pope's service or to follow the court' (178v). The demands of diplomatic service have a calamitous effect upon the poet, diverting the springs of his Helicon, "l'acqua che di Parnaso si deriva" 'the water that flows down from Parnassus,' and withering the fruit of his olive tree, emblem of poetic wisdom: "L'oliva è secca" 'The olive tree is dry.' The major casualty is Petrarch's commitment to Latin style.

In sonnet 24, "Se l'onorata fronde che prescrive" 'If the honored branch that protects one,' Petrarch offers another striking figuration of the olive tree, this time attributing blame to Laura for distracting him. In Vellutello's paraphrase, "Quella ingiuria fattami, come uuole inferire, da M. L. di tenermi in tante amare passioni GIA mi sprona, gia mi fa andar lungi DA l'inuentrice de le prime oliue, cio è da Minerua Dea delle scientie" 'As he implies, this injury done to me by Laura, of distracting me with so many bitter emotions, forces me to stray far from the inventor of the first olives, Minerva, goddess of the sciences' (177v). In this figuration Petrarch's pursuit of ancient wisdom reaches its limit in Laura. Her presence keeps returning him to a volatile, hypertrophic reality in Avignon.

A concept of poetic destiny underlies addresses to other Italian poets in part 3 of Vellutello's sequence. They include sonnet 7, a complaint about abuses of the times; sonnet 92, a lament on the death of Cino da Pistoia; and sonnet 287, a lament on the death of Sennuccio del Bene. Vellutello identifies the recipient of sonnet 7 as Boccaccio, Petrarch's most distinguished literary compeer.[24] Its speaker inveighs against "la gola e 'l sonno et l'oziose piume" 'gluttony and sleep and the pillows of idleness,' and he exhorts the younger poet "non lassar la magnanima tua impresa" 'not to abandon your magnanimous undertaking.' As Vellutello construes it, "il presente So. secondo la opinione d'alcuni, fu mandato dal Poe. a Giouanni Boccaccio da Certaldo, dubitandosi, che per uilta d'animo, o qual si fosse altra cagione non abbandonasse i principiati studi, a quelli seguitare" 'the present sonnet, according to the opinion of some, was sent by the poet to Giovanni Boccaccio at Certaldo, questioning whether through cowardice of spirit or some other reason he had abandoned the stud-

ies that he had begun' (176r). In Vellutello's view Petrarch stands above the fray of poetic competition in Italy by encouraging his friend and potential rival to literary excellence. As the recipient of generosity from his own patrons, Petrarch becomes a protector of other poets and helps to dissolve rivalries among them.

Sonnet 92, "Piangete, Donne, et con voi pianga Amore" 'Weep, Ladies, and let Love weep with you,' inscribes Petrarch's homage to Cino da Pistoia (1270–1336). More than either Petrarch or Boccaccio, Cino pursued a highly visible career of public service. As a scholar, he contributed to legal reform in Italian politics: "Della nobile famiglia de Sighibuldi, dottissimo in utroque Iu. Compose sopra del Codico una lettura utilissima, Et sopra una parte del digesto uecchio, & sopra gli altri digesti, cio è lo infortiato et innovo molte additioni" 'From the noble family of Sighibundi, most learned in both kinds of law, he composed a very useful commentary on the Codex [of Justinian] and on a part of the old digest and on the other digests, that is, he strengthened them and introduced many additions' (195r). In Vellutello's view Cino represents a nearly ideal combination of poetic talent "in componer uersi e rime uolgari d'amore" 'in composing [Latin] verses and vernacular rhymes about love' and public service in the name of Italian unity, a runner-up to Petrarch in the former and a near-equal to him in the latter.

For the final poem in his reorganized sequence Vellutello designates sonnet 287, a lament for the death in 1349 of a Florentine poet, "Sennuccio mio, benché doglioso et solo / m'abbi lasciato" 'My Sennuccio, though you have left me alone and sorrowing.' In Vellutello's narrative Sennuccio takes his place in the third celestial sphere, the abode of lovers, where Laura resides and which Petrarch will visit in his *Trionfo d'amore.* Here Sennuccio joins "l'altra schiera di volgari scrittori di quel tempo da lui nel triompho d'Amore nomati, liquali per essere in uita stati soggetti ad amore, & cose amatorie hauere scritto, mette che siano ne la terza spera, laqual a Venere e attribuita" 'the other band of vernacular writers of that time cited by Petrarch in his *Trionfo d'Amore,* and because in this life they were subject to Love and wrote about amatory matters, Petrarch asserts that they should be in the third sphere which is assigned to Venus' (201r). Vellutello has effectively posited the idea of a brigade to which Petrarch belongs, "pregandolo, che ne la terza spera saluti Guitton bonati d'Arezzo, messer Cino da Pistoia, Dante excellente & notissimo Poe. Franceschino" 'praying that in the third sphere Sennuccio might greet Guitton Bonati d'Arezzo, Cino da Pistoia, the excellent and most famous Dante, and the poet Franceschino [dagli Albizzi]' (201r). The poet accordingly signals his own status in a hierarchy of literary achievement.[25]

With Boccaccio in sonnet 7 and Sennuccio in sonnet 287, Petrarch now joins Guittone, Cino, Dante, and Franceschino degli Albizzi as the seventh worthy poet. He has instituted a *pléiade,* his own band of seven distinguished writers who divert their competitive drives from one another. In Vellutello's scheme, not the least of Petrarch's reasons for exalting these writers is that they shared his Ghibelline inclinations in turbulent political times. Vellutello profiles Petrarch's loyalties by anchoring part 3 with eight sonnets (*Rime sparse* 7, 27, 103, 104, 114, and 136 to 138), three canzoni (28, 53, and 128), and one frottola (105) criticizing papal imperialism and the rapacity of squabbling magnates in the empire. Sonnets 136 to 138, for example, compare the vices of the papal court at Avignon with those of the Babylonian Empire.[26] In sonnet 136 Avignon is a nest of treachery where lecherous old men debauch young victims; in sonnet 137 it is a sack bursting with greed and perversity; in sonnet 138 it is a school of error, a temple of heresy. Vellutello explains how Petrarch "biasmandola generalmente di tutta i vitij, ma in specialita di rapina, di tradimento, di gola, e di lussuria" 'accuses the papacy in general of every vice, but in particular of violence, treachery, greed, and sloth' (179^{r}).[27]

Commentators after Vellutello certainly profit from his mastery of details, his historical erudition, and his effort to contextualize the poetry's implied narrative, while they adapt his patriotic perspective to the changing times. A barometer of their sentiments can be found in their responses to canzone 128, "Italia mia" 'My Italy,' a poem explicit in its patriotic sentiment and, in the view of subsequent history, one that acts as a magnet for citing Petrarch in protonationalist contexts. Its outrage at "Bavarico inganno" 'Bavarian treachery' points to its historical situation (66). Most commentators identify it with the violence of German mercenaries who aided opposing Italian lords in their struggle to control Parma in 1344–45.[28] This reading, first offered by Filelfo and now shared by modern historians, builds upon the description in *Familiares* 5.10 of the poet's flight from Parma in February 1345.[29] In Filelfo's view "ch' alzando il dito colla morte scherza" 'which lifting its finger toys with death' refers to the mercenaries' halfhearted commitment as they protected their own self-interests and avoided real sacrifice (67).

As Filelfo explains, such conflicts exemplify a long-standing need for Visconti leadership. In his chronology German aggression had already imperiled Italy before Petrarch's birth. Its instigator was Emperor Albert of Austria, ruling from 1298 to 1308, whence the "distructione dele gente todesche lequale eran in quel tempo a petitione e richiesta de limperadore Alberto" 'destruction

by German troops that had descended into Italy at this time upon the petition and request of Emperor Albert.' Only a hegemonic Visconti rule might heal such wounds, a solution that Filelfo finds appropriate in Petrarch's time as well as in his own.[30] Filelfo describes the poem's address to warring lords of Italy who resist Milanese supremacy: "Drizza il suo parlare uniuersalmente a tutta italia per rispecto de romani e di fiorentini e de lombardi. . . . Honestamente gli riprende come ingrati e senza alchuna compassione e carita uerso la patria: comportando tante gente darme todesche" 'He addresses his words to all Italy embracing the Romans, Florentines, and Lombards. . . . He frankly reproves them as ungrateful and without compassion or charity for unleashing so many German armies against the homeland' (127^{r}).

Vellutello radically disavows Filelfo's interpretation, and the reason is that in his view its pro-Viscontian propaganda evokes the specter of fratricidal strife in Italy. To circumvent this taboo and its calamitous consequences in his own time, Vellutello shifts the poem's focus to invective against foreign aggression. For him the "bavarico inganno" refers to the treachery of Albert's successor, Lewis IV of Bavaria, who gained the support of anti-Hapsburg German magnates for his election as Holy Roman emperor in 1322. Angry at Pope John XXII's refusal to confirm this title, Lewis descended into Italy in 1327–28 and terrorized it for nearly two decades, prefiguring the French and Spanish invasions of Italy after 1494.

Vellutello attributes additional significance to the poem by linking it to the beginning of Petrarch's love for Laura. He speculates that Petrarch wrote it at the start of Lewis's campaign and that it survives as the first of his Italian compositions, afterward followed by his amatory verse: "Fu fatta da lui l'anno di nostra salute MCCCXXVIII. che fu l'anno seguente, nelquale di M. L. s'era innamorato, & auanti, che di lei alcuna cosa cominciasse a scriuere" 'It was composed by him in 1328, the year after he fell in love with Laura, and before he began to write anything about her.' Petrarch initially stood to profit from Lewis's intervention: "Essendo ne la città di Milano, oue da Valclusa era venuto, sperando col mezzo di Lodouico Bauaro, ilquale con valido essercito in Italia era disceso, essere insieme con gli altri ribelli di Firenze in patria restituto" 'He was in the city of Milan, having come from Vaucluse, hoping to be restored to his native city along with other exiles from Florence through the agency of Lewis the Bavarian, who had descended into Italy with a powerful army' (171^{v}). In short order, however, Petrarch comes to decry Lewis's land-grabbing motives. Vellutello situates canzone 128 as the first poem in the newly

designated third part of his rearranged sequence, explicating it as a cautionary tale in the political life of its author as he edges toward a new understanding of his national attachment.[31]

Two years after Vellutello published his commentary Charles V's imperial troops sacked Rome (1527). Commentators afterward couple Petrarch's fourteenth-century anxieties to sixteenth-century concerns about Charles V's Holy Roman Empire.[32] The Hapsburg heir upheld his rights over Naples, Rome, and Milan in order to proclaim his direct dynastic descent from ancient Rome and thereby enjoin a new world order with universal stability. He also wanted to situate Italy in a line of defense against Ottoman invasions in the south and Lutheran and Calvinist rebellion in the north. The rest of Europe saw the matter differently as a bid to impose harsh Spanish rule upon the entire Continent. Later Petrarchan commentators interpreted canzone 128 in the context of national sentiment and a deep-rooted pessimism about Charles V's empire.

Gesualdo, for example, chronicles three possible scenarios: the invasion of Lewis the Bavarian; the siege of Parma pitting the Visconti against the lords of northern Italy; and a war between Genoa and Venice enlisting Milan on behalf of the former and Padua, Verona, Mantua, and the Emperor Charles IV on behalf of the latter.[33] The poem's style greatly impresses him as an attempt at epic composition. He admires the formal structure of its invocations and its narrative, implying Petrarch's lofty ambitions to write heroic verse: "E, perche la materia è heroica, uolle qui imitare gli heroici poeti" 'And because the topic is heroic, he wishes to imitate here the heroic poets' (CLXXVIII^{r}). Its indictment of abusive power aims at rulers with false claims to authority, such as Lewis or his successor, Charles IV of Luxembourg and Bohemia, or even their current avatar, Charles V of Spain: "Quando adunque al nome non rispondono i fatti, il nome si dice uano, e senza soggetto. onde generalmente il potresti intendere per qualunque imperatore de suoi tempi, e di nostri, che hanno il nome senza imperio" 'When the facts do not correspond to the word, the word is said to be empty and without subject. Hence you could generally understand it to mean some emperor of his time, or even of ours, who might enjoy the title without the right to rule' (CLXXXII^{r}). The Neapolitan commentator's barb directed at Charles V condemns the Spanish conquest of Naples as an illegitimate claim to rule and an obstacle to Italian national unity.

Sylvano da Venafro likewise views the historical record from a Neapolitan perspective, but he recognizes that amid long-standing Italian conflicts Petrarch is referring to an aggregate of events. One result is that all of Italy has become contested territory down to the present, lacking in national cohesion,

"di modo che tante queste della chiesa come quelle del imperio tutte restorno occupate fin al tempo di Alessandro sesto & molti al di hoggi" 'so that all the lands of the church as well as of the Empire remained occupied until the time of Pope Alexander VI, and many remain so today.' Another is that the poem cannot be assigned a precise date. On stylistic grounds Sylvano argues that its formal mastery precludes its composition in Petrarch's youth, when Lewis first invaded Italy: "Non e ragione che fusse scritta da lui sendo di eta di xxii o xxiii anni: nel scrivere di poca sperienza anchor novello" 'It is not reasonable that it was written by him at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three years, still quite young and with little experience in writing' (CIX^{v}). Such a claim radically revises Vellutello's oblique connection between Petrarch's amatory verse and his political poetry. In Sylvano's view Petrarch could develop his skills as a political thinker and writer only after he had matured as a love poet.[34]

Bernardino Daniello specifically relates the poem's style to its historical situation. On the whole he attributes the latter to the Ghibellines' support of imperial rule: "Italia, laquale al suo tempo era molto infestata, e guasta dalle barbare nationi, per cagion della parte Ghibellina, che le vi tenia" 'Italy at this time was greatly overrun and laid waste by barbarian nations through the workings of the Ghibelline party that sustained them there.' Like Gesualdo and Sylvano, Daniello notes that this topic requires a mastery grounded in ancient, especially Virgilian, models: "A gli alti soggetti; come son quelli delle guerre, par che il piu alto, e sublime stile si richiedesse in descriverle" 'As for such elevated topics as those of war, it seems that the most elevated and sublime style is required for describing them' (89^{r}). As the referent for "alzando il dito" (67), he names Lewis of Bavaria, who had arranged the deaths of Galeazzo, Stefano, and Marco Visconti "con alzare il dito, dando loro la fede, e non l'osseruando poi" 'by raising his finger, pledging his faith to them, but not observing it afterwards.' In an alternate interpretation Daniello evokes the taboo of factionalism: "Overo nel alzar del dito, dimandando li di che fattion fosse alcuno" 'Or in lifting one's finger, asking to which faction one belonged' (91^{r}). The figure constitutes a metonymy for the breakdown of national sentiment.

Still other commentators sympathetic to Lutheran Reform locate the poem's historical action in a context of biblical pronouncements about the rise and fall of nations. Fausto da Longiano reads the poem as an affirmation of divine providence.[35] Moved by *caritas,* effective grace conferred as God's gift to humankind, Petrarch urges his compatriots to a stronger sense of Italian unity: "Onde 'l nostro gentil Poe. mosso da vna certa carita verso l'amato paese scriue questa canzo. ai signori d'Italia essortandoli alla vnione contra le gentii strane"

'Whence our gentle poet, moved by a certain charity toward his beloved homeland, addresses this canzone to the lords of Italy, exhorting them to union against foreign armies' (188^{v}). Conversely, Antonio Brucioli argues that the poem's representation of internecine strife shows God's wrath upon those who harm their national communities in a shameless pursuit of selfish goals: "Duolsi in questa presente canzone il petrarca delle miserie nelle quali si trouaua la Italia ne suoi tempi. Et della malignita de principi christiani, che la lasciassino cosi miseramente disfare" 'In this present canzone Petrarch laments the miseries in which Italy found itself in his times, and the evil of Christian princes who would allow it to come so miserably undone.' Brucioli adds that these issues still plague Italy as "miserie nelle quali si trouaua la Italia ne suoi tempi, & anchora ne nostri si troua" 'miseries in which Italy found itself in Petrarch's time and still finds itself in ours' (99^{v}).

Castelvetro, the last commentator in this grouping, likewise expresses views sympathetic to the Lutheran cause. For the poem's opening lines, "Italia mia, ben che 'l parlar sia indarno / a le piaghe mortali" 'My Italy, although speech does not aid those mortal wounds,' he recalls the synoptic Gospels' contrast between words and deeds: "Et par, che senta l'historia del vangelo di colui, che s'auenne ne ladroni, & fedito a morte, gli furono date parole dal Leuita, ma aiuto dal Samaritano" 'And it seems that one might hear the Evangelist's story of one who fell in with robbers and, nearly beaten to death, was given words by the Levite but help by the Samaritan' (245). He associates Petrarch's evocation of Fortune, "Voi cui Fortuna à posto in mano il freno / de le belle contrade" 'You into whose hands Fortune has given the reins of these lovely regions' (17–18), with St. Paul's emphasis on God's foreordaining power, "che egli per Paolo dice, Non est potestas, nisi a Deo. Rom. 13.1" 'where God speaks through Paul: "For there is no power but of God," Romans 13.1 (245). To the words of rulers who reflect upon their own relation to Italian soil, "Non è questo 'l terren ch' i' toccai pria?" 'Is this not the ground that I touched first?' (81), he summons the rituals of ancient pagans condemned by St. Augustine: "Par, che senta certa vana religione de Pagani . . . Augustinus 14. De Ciuitate Dei" 'It seems that one might hear the empty religion of pagans . . . as in chapter 14 of St. Augustine's *City of God*' (245). And to Petrarch's forecast of a final judgment, "chè l'alma ignuda et sola / conven ch' arrive a quel dubbioso calle" 'think of your departure, for the soul must go naked and alone on that perilous path' (101–2), he compares Ecclesiastes 5.14: "Sicut prodijs ex vtero matris suae, sic reverteretur nudus, & nihil auferet secum de labore suo" 'As he came forth naked of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as he

came, and shall take nothing of his labor' (245). For readers convinced of the paradigmatic workings of God's grace and divine election in human affairs, the poem measures the suffering of Italians as a dispossessed, alienated people—in the biblical sense, an *ethnos* or *gens* (nation)—in thrall to their own imperfections and the perversity of others.

Commentators such as Filelfo, Vellutello, Gesualdo, and Sylvano da Venafro alert readers to Petrarch's blurring of erotic ardor, religious impulses, and political allegiance.[36] Just as the lover's efforts to seek Laura result in his *rime sparse* and potential loss of soul, so the warring lords' forced effort to "cercar gente" 'seek a [foreign] people' to serve as mercenaries produces the outcome "che spargo 'l sangue et venda l'alma a prezzo" 'that they shed blood and sell their soul for a price' (61–62). And the supraregional audience that Petrarch addresses, "Voi cui Fortuna à posto in mano il freno / . . . di che nulla pietà par che vi stringa" 'You into whose hands Fortune has given the reins for which no pity seems to move you' (17–19), expands upon that of sonnet 1, "Voi ch' ascoltate in rime sparse il suono / di quei sospiri" 'You who hear in scattered rhymes the sound of those sighs,' from whom he hopes to find "pietà, non che perdono" 'pity, not only pardon.'

To look to these commentaries for Petrarch's patriotic sentiments is to find difference and diversity, a welter of conflicting interpretations that record the commentators' own national sentiments. The latters' foregrounding of Petrarch's political discourse serves notice to sixteenth-century readers that the language of Petrarchism is more than an expression of amatory devotion. It is, or can be made to be, a conveyor of political goals, imperial aspirations, and national conscience. As it dramatizes the lover's passions, it lays bare the savagery and frenzy that also disturb the body politic. The proximity of *amor,* the power of eros to *patria,* the power of community, defines the character of both *amor* and *patria.* The most widely reprinted commentator, Vellutello, draws attention to this connection by positioning Petrarch's nonamatory poems in a triad that includes Petrarch's amatory poetry *in vita di Laura* and *in morte di Laura.* The sheer bulk of Vellutello's newly constructed *Terza Parte* (Third Part) of Petrarch's *Rime sparse* throws into bold relief the concerns of Petrarch's poetry about a national consciousness and the workings of tyranny and empire, and it testifies to the totemic power of these motifs and to their integration with the rest of his poetry. Alerted to the disposition of these motifs in a reconstituted *Rime sparse,* later poets and commentators would approach Petrarch with a heightened social, cultural, political, and historical awareness of their own national sentiments.

3 Amor *and* Patria

Citing Petrarch in Florence and Naples

Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentators were not the first readers to detect links between *amor* and *patria* in Petrarch's poetry. His premier contemporary disciple, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–74), wrote a collection of sonnets whose amatory focus, like Petrarch's, incorporates social, cultural, political, and historical criticism.[1] It recounts the poet's love for the Neapolitan "Fiammetta" during his youth in Naples (1327–40/41), years that overlap with Petrarch's earliest vernacular poems and indicate the latter's astonishingly prompt reception in the Angevin court. Shortly after Boccaccio's departure in late 1340 or early 1341, Petrarch visited Naples to receive King Robert's sponsorship for his coronation at Rome. Two and a half years later, in November 1343, Petrarch returned to Naples and lamented that after Robert's death the preceding January the kingdom showed "no piety, no truth, no faith" and all signs of collapse (*Fam.* 5.3: 234–25/435–36), a judgment already registered in Boccaccio's *Rime*.[2] Petrarch found Naples so depraved that it no longer shared the Italian ethos that he identified with Rome, Parma, Padua, and Verona. This experience set the stage for his eventual loss of faith in a pan-Italian order. Boccaccio registers a similar disappointment in his *Rime,* in which the beloved's betrayal saps the speaker's self-assurance and leads to a crisis of confidence in the values of his *patria.*

As a result of his disillusionment, Boccaccio renounced his *Rime* and burned his manuscript in 1364, allowing the survival of some 126 poems already in random circulation.[3] The result is a more scattered collection than Petrarch's, with a concentration of amatory poems in its first half and many de-

votional and occasional poems in its second half. Its implied narrative offers a highly romanticized account of the poet's experience in Naples, when, as an apprentice of his father, an associate of the Bardi banking company who managed King Robert's financial affairs, he enjoyed some access to the Franco-Angevin court. Disaffected with his father's bourgeois career and with alternative plans to study law, he devoted himself to poetry and to the love of Fiammetta, whose name bears the emblem of Maria d'Aquino, an illegitimate daughter of the king.[4]

In *Filocolo* 5.8 (1336–38) Boccaccio had invented for himself a mythic ancestry of royal birth to erase his illegitimacy. Through his unknown mother he claimed to descend from the kings of France and ultimately from Francus through Hector to Dardanus, from whom Fiammetta also descends.[5] In this version of Freud's "family romance" the poet's painful but necessary liberation from his parents signals a traumatic conflict between successive generations upon which "the whole progress of society rests."[6] Boccaccio, dissatisfied with his lot, imagines himself an illegitimate child separated at birth from biological parents of a higher social, cultural, and intellectual standing whose patrimony he intuitively displays. He springs neither from provincial Certaldo nor from the Republic of Florence but from an international aristocracy with roots in ancient Troy. In the *Ninfale fiesolano* Boccaccio would go on to provide genealogical accounts of his major characters, each of whom claims to have been separated from a putatively noble or royal parent. Parallel to these accounts is a narrative about the origins of Florence (Prose 38). Founded by Atlas, destroyed by barbarians, and restored by Charlemagne, it derives its greatness from a hybrid of Greco-French influence.[7]

The story of Boccaccio's *Rime* likewise tells of social stratification and class conflict, but here its speaker's effort to take on a new identity invites disaster. His amatory interest leads to failure and frustration when the higher-born beloved rejects him for others of her own standing. Such a narrative dominates early biographies that weigh Boccaccio's oedipal struggle with his bourgeois father against his aspiration toward a life of poetry and learning. In Giannozzo Manetti's *Life of Boccaccio* (1440s) the young man "shrank by nature from financial arts of [his father's] sort, and he was felt to be more suited to literary studies. . . . Accordingly, when he seemed of an age to be his own master he decided to abandon [legal] studies as well and turn to poetry before all else."[8] Hieronimo Squarzafico's *Life of Boccaccio* (appended to an edition of *Filocolo* printed at Venice in 1467 and reprinted at Milan in 1476) links the poet's frustration to his subordinate status.[9] Recounting his career from a pro-Milanese,

pro-Viscontian perspective, Squarzafico dwells on Boccaccio's scornful nature. Unlike Petrarch, who had accepted Viscontian support, Boccaccio could not bring himself to submit to any powerful lord in such a fashion: "Fu questo messer Boccatio . . . molto disdegnoso di natura, il quale vicio molto li fu contrario nelli studii, perché mai né a signori né ad altri se volse accostare, tanto era della sua propria libertate amatore. Né a nessuno, per premio che avesse potuto avere, avrebbe scripto epistole né versi" 'This Boccaccio was by nature quite disdainful, a vice that is not very conducive to scholarship since he would attach himself to no lords or any one else, so great a lover was he of his own freedom. Nor for any compensation that he would have been able to receive would he have written letters or verses for anyone' (Solerti, ed., p. 697).

In this environment the *Rime* express Boccaccio's ascetic apprenticeship in poetry and his pursuit of higher social standing in the Kingdom of Naples, where sybaritic courtiers mingled with Franco-Angevin royalty, a competing Spanish Aragonese nobility, migrant Provençal professionals, and a flood of transient merchants and adventurers from northern Italy.[10] The *Rime* begin with the poet's idealized love for Fiammetta rehearsed in an elevated mode of the Stil Nuovo. As his desire grows more passionate and conflicted, the speaker shifts to a Petrarchan mode overlaid with heightened references to classical myth, legend, and history. The latter focus on narratives of deluded self-origin among such figures as Arion (sonnet 6), Antiphon (sonnet 7), Narcissus (sonnet 33), Prometheus (sonnet 38), and Ulysses (sonnet 62), many drawn from the elegies of Ovid and Propertius, with their exempla of failed self-restraint and lapsed moral civility.[11] In sonnets 60 to 62 the beloved retreats to a villa at aristocratic Baia, where she forswears her fidelity to the speaker: "Ed è di questo Baia la cagione, / la qual invita sì col suo diletto / colei che là s'emporta la mia pace" 'The reason for this is Baia, that with its pleasures so invites her that my peace is borne away there' (sonnet 60). In sonnet 65 the speaker decries Baia's reputation for sexual license ("Se io temo di Baia e il celo e il mare . . . / alcun non se ne dee maravigliare" 'If I fear the sky and sea of Baia, no one should wonder why'), and in sonnets 71 to 73, situated after the speaker's implied return to Florence, he inveighs against its corrupting influence, "ché hai corrotto la più casta mente, / che fosse 'n donna, con la tua licenza" 'because with your licentiousness you have corrupted the most chaste mind that a lady ever possessed' (sonnet 72).

Later sonnets extend the speaker's negative estimate with comparisons of Naples to Florence and northern Italy. Corruption and immorality reign there as well: "Fuggit'è ogni virtù, spent'è il valore / che fece Italia già donna del

mondo" 'Every virtue has fled, spent is the valor that made Italy the mistress of the world' (sonnet 93). Depravity cripples not only the old aristocracy and rising magnates but also citizenry in the merchant and artisan classes, the *popolo grasso* and the *popolo minuto:* "E insieme con esse leggiadria / dalle villane menti disciacciata" 'And together with these practices has beauty been driven away from common thinking' (sonnet 94). Finally it brings down writers and scholars, dividing them into factions unduly critical of one another's work. As Boccaccio's collection draws to a close, the speaker addresses his critics, some of them honest and helpful in assessing his work, others merely invidious in their barbed judgment: "Credo sarebbe cosa assai onesta / prima lavasse il tuo gran vitupero / che mordesse l'altrui" 'I think it would have been more honest of you to have cleaned up your own execrable behavior before taking a bite into that of others' (sonnet 121). The final poem, a valediction on Petrarch's death, names some poets from the predecessor's Italian pantheon but omits others (Guittone and Franceschino), presumably because by himself Boccaccio makes up for their absence: "Or se' colà, dove spesso il desio / ti tirò già per veder Lauretta. . . . / Or con Sennuccio e con Cino e con Dante / vivi, securo d'etterno riposo" 'Now you go where your desire often drew you to see Laura. . . . Now live with Sennuccio and Cino and Dante, secure in eternal rest' (sonnet 126).[12] Bereft of her Tuscan poets, Italy grieves her lack of cultural and political cohesion.

As Petrarch's first major poetic imitator, Boccaccio had become Petrarch's first major critical commentator in practice, and later he would become a line-by-line commentator on Dante in public lectures on the first seventeen cantos of *Inferno* at Florence in 1373–74.[13] As negative as Boccaccio had been in his assessment of Florence and Naples in his *Rime,* here he proclaims his pride in the distinctiveness of Italy and its cultural heritage. This pride motivates him to exhort Italians to distinguish themselves from the rest of Europe. His commentary on the adulterers in canto 5, for example, includes a digression on immodest clothing and lascivious behavior that Italians have shamefully imported from "l'usanze dell'altre nazioni" 'the customs of other nations.'[14] Italy, he argues, had once been the master of those "nazioni strane . . . che furon vinte e soggiogate da noi" 'foreign nations . . . that were conquered and subjected by us,' and so must set a positive example for such "nazioni barbare" (334). Foremost among the centers of Italy in setting such an example should be a morally rehabilitated Republic of Florence.

Wracked by fratricidal strife in Boccaccio's lifetime, Florence would undergo a spectacular cultural and political development in the fifteenth cen-

tury.[15] In reaction to lower-class rebellion that culminated in the Ciompi Revolt of 1378 and to recurrent Visconti aggression until 1433, Florentine political institutions devised highly conservative mechanisms to prevent the domination of any single faction, ruler, or ruling party. In this climate of distrust one prosperous but formerly obscure family nonetheless managed to assume preeminence, de facto if not always de jure, with stunning consequences. From 1469 to 1492 in the person of its head, Lorenzo de' Medici, its leadership appeared on the way to becoming hereditary, absolute, and dynastic. The rise of the Medici coincided with a broad sentiment in Florence approving the republic's conquest of outlying territories and its control over weaker dominions in the face of external aggression. It coincided as well with a shift in the humanist representation of the city's origins from a hybrid genesis to a planned settlement instituted by Augustus, implying its ancient imperialist legacy.[16] It is no accident that with (often minimal) Medici support, humanist scholarship aspired to new and higher standards of ambition and that through his own literary practice Lorenzo himself reclaimed Petrarch for the cultural patrimony of Florence.[17]

Lorenzo's adoption of Petrarch as a totemic figure projects a version of family romance in which, as head of the Medici family, with its undistinguished genealogical roots in the Mugello and no political capital until the fifteenth century, he claims a poetic ancestor with impeccable credentials. In the larger world of Italian power politics Leonardo's inscription of Petrarch likewise projects a conscious design to promote Florentine culture at home and abroad.[18] Just as the northern commentators had tried to fix an image of the poet amid the struggles of Milanese expansionism, so Lorenzo in the 1470s and 1480s brought Petrarch home to Florence by imitating his Italian poetry and framing the results with a self-written commentary.[19] In both his *Rime* and his *Comento sopra alcuni dei suoi sonetti* Lorenzo's use of the Petrarchan mode comes to serve political ends in ways that forecast sixteenth-century Petrarchism.[20] Not the least is its figuration of Lorenzo's sacrificial offering to Love which symbolically enacts the ruler's devotion to the state. Like a Petrarchan lover, Lorenzo undergoes a transformation that relates the rhetorical world of poetry to the active world of politics.[21]

Petrarch's vernacular reception in mid-fifteenth-century Florence bears visible marks of an elite culture that displayed it as a commodity for prominent citizens.[22] Lorenzo's poetry addresses this culture, while his rhetorical commentary promotes a critical analysis based upon humanist principles.[23] Such principles inform the contrasting careers of two scholars supported by

Lorenzo in the 1470s and 1480s, Cristoforo Landino and Angelo Poliziano.[24] Both offer distinct alternatives to the older analogical methods of interpretation by late medieval glossators which accord with the Augustinian principle of welcoming each and every spiritual or moral allegory into the kingdom of hermeneutics as long as it promotes the doctrine of charity.[25] Landino and Poliziano abandoned this principle altogether when they set about to restrict the possible meanings of a text to putatively "original" historical meanings. Theirs is the sort of commentary that sixteenth-century annotators would bring to Petrarch's vernacular poetry.

The analytical presuppositions of Lorenzo and Poliziano nonetheless diverge quite sharply. As a teacher of the young Lorenzo in the 1460s, Landino encouraged a complex philosophical understanding of classical texts through direct reference to Platonic schemata.[26] He approached cultural differences in the past by acknowledging that ancient systems of thought do not necessarily concur with Christian systems of belief. In the *Quaestiones Camaldulenses* (1472), for example, he explains how Virgil's *Aeneid* charts a forest of symbols that express Plato's moral philosophy in ways that may baffle later readers. The reason is that the *Aeneid* is a historical poem with concrete meanings rooted in a specific time and place. Virgil deploys poetic materials that are "not those which he himself might choose by his own genius, but those which history offers."[27] With these materials he imparts a deeper significance to his narrative "in such a way that although he did not abandon history, he nevertheless expressed through it . . . the sum of human felicity" (61). At one stroke Landino dismantles every generalizing assumption of late medieval allegoresis and puts in its place an analytic mode of criticism and interpretation grounded in temporal and material specificity. Although Landino often lacked pointed and precise documentary evidence to validate his hermeneutic convictions, he nonetheless announced an important conceptual breakthrough in envisioning the past.

By the 1480s further advances took shape, not the least through the scholarship and example of Landino's former student and now younger rival, Angelo Poliziano. As the latter gained renown, Landino undertook to emulate his techniques, devoting himself to a rigorous philological exactitude in studying source texts, literary cross-references, grammatical structures, and rhetorical conventions. The result was Landino's edition of Virgil's works published in 1487–88 with an elaborate commentary that proclaims a new critical approach to the *Aeneid,* "nam quemadmodum in chamaldulenensibus philosophi interpretis munus obivimus, sic in his commentariis grammatici rhetorisque vices praestabimus" 'for as in the *Camaldulenses* we discharged the services of a

philosopher in interpreting the texts, so in these commentaries we will fulfill the duties of a grammarian and rhetorician.'[28] The commentary is a monument to scholarly detail replete with facts, figures, historical information, and linguistic analysis, and it affords a model for later commentary on Petrarch by Vellutello and Gesualdo, Daniello and Castelvetro.

Landino was adopting a method that Poliziano had pursued after encountering neo-Aristotelian empiricism at Padua and Venice. There he had benefited from Ermolao Barbaro's recuperation of Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* in the 1470s, sensing their usefulness in ways that foretold the future of humanist scholarship and forever changed his work.[29] Heeding the call to empiricism as well as to Aristotle's formalism, Poliziano now incorporated concrete archaeological, anthropological, and historical evidence into a detailed examination of stylistic expression and rhetorical construction. After his reconciliation with Lorenzo and his appointment to the Florentine Studio in the 1480s, Poliziano gave testimony to his discoveries in letters to Barbaro and others, in his prolusionary poem on literary history, *Nutricia* (1486), and above all in his *Miscellanea* (published in 1489 and 1494 but available to Landino before then), two collections of short, specialized essay-treatises on a variety of such isolated and often unrelated topics as source identification, authorial attribution, orthographic emendation, and textual exegesis.[30]

Just as classical scholarship followed a trajectory from moral allegoresis to rhetorical analysis and historical reconstruction, so did later criticism of vernacular poetry. Landino's detailed commentary on Dante's *Commedia* (1481) accordingly reinterprets the historical conditions of the text's production. Addressing an elite readership of Florentine citizens, untitled "illustrious lords" of a republican aristocracy, Landino tries to reinstate Dante as a true Florentine: "We shall demonstrate that Dante did not disgrace the homeland," and hence "we shall prove that our own Republic should not be criticized."[31] Dante's exile impugns not the place of his birth, Florence, site of ancient liberty but an era of fractious partisan politics: "This was a fault of the times, and not one of the nature of the people" (116). The republic can reclaim Dante from exile precisely because he harnessed his language to its values: "He was the first who ennobled with fullness and elegance, with erudition and ornament our own native tongue" (126). After Dante came Petrarch, Boccaccio, Leon Battista Alberti, and others who refined Florentine discourse, and finally Lorenzo himself: "Already there is flourishing one who—if my judgment is worth anything—will be in the first of the most rare" (128).

As Lorenzo's former teacher, Landino gave himself credit for his pupil's po-

etic production, the fruit of "my most faithful precepts" (129). When Lorenzo was seventeen years old Landino had delivered a series of controversial lectures on Petrarch.[32] Here Petrarch's poetry displays an eloquence that can improve the Tuscan vernacular, "acciò che con quelle possiate eliminare e crescere la lingua patria" 'so that with these examples you can weed out and recultivate the language of the fatherland.'[33] Eloquence is a vital adjunct to the pursuit of free speech in a republic: "La eloquenzia poté da principio gl'uomini . . . in uno ceto e congregazione ragunare, e, ragunati, alle leggi e al giusto vivere sottomettergli" 'Eloquence can gather people . . . into a social order and assembly, and, so gathered, can make them submit to law and upright order' (39).[34] Great writers not only celebrate great patriotic deeds in the past, but they also encourage great patriotic deeds in the present and future. This lesson was certainly not lost on Lorenzo.

In 1476 Lorenzo sent to Federigo of Aragon, son of the king of Naples, an anthology of Florentine poetry, the so-called *Raccolta aragonese* (Aragonese Collection), with a prefatory letter extolling the preeminence of Tuscan over other forms of Italian usage. The letter, possibly ghostwritten by Poliziano, associates excellence in poetic composition with excellence in the social and political order.[35] Not only does it collect samples of the best Tuscan verse, but, by appending some of Lorenzo's own verse, including four sonnets later used in his *Comento,* it reifies the linguistic superiority of Tuscan, the cultural excellence of Florence, and the political aptitude of the Medicis. The *Raccolta* includes examples of non-Florentine poetry (e.g., verse by Guido d'Arezzo, Bonagiunta da Lucca, Guido Guinizelli of Bologna, Cino da Pistoia) but only as predecessors whom authentically Florentine poets—Dante, Petrarch, and Lorenzo himself—finally surpass. In recovering these texts, in correcting the reception of earlier commentators on Dante and Petrarch, and in offering a commentary on his own poems, Lorenzo completes the task of his predecessors.

Like the *Raccolta,* Lorenzo's *Comento* repeatedly acknowledges the literary language of Florence as a collective achievement, and it refers especially to the master texts of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio as proof of its power.[36] Lorenzo argues that political illusions lead us to attach greater value to some languages rather than others. Linguistic or poetic hegemony, the consensus of prestige that one language or set of poetic conventions acquires over another, resides in the eye of the beholder: "A language's being valued and highly celebrated in the world consists in the opinion of those who prize and esteem it." Latin acquired its early prestige not through any intrinsic merits of its own but, rather, through fortune and the expansion of Roman Imperium: "Such a dignity as

this of being prized for a felicitous event of fortune is very applicable to the Latin language, because the expansion of the Roman Empire [*Imperio Romano*] not only made it common through all the world, but also almost necessary" (47). There is no reason to suppose the Tuscan language less capable than ancient Latin of promoting the cultural imperium of modern Florence. The analogy is clear to Lorenzo as he regards the beginning of Florentine literature: "And both in its youth and its adulthood, it could still easily reach major perfection, and much more so if some propitious event and the growth of the Florentine empire [*fiorentino imperio*] as well join forces with it—as one must not only hope, but also must strive for with all one's talent and strength on behalf of the good citizens" (51). This prospect of a *fiorentino imperio* subtends the argument of Lorenzo's *Comento.*

As the author of his own poetry, Lorenzo presents himself as best equipped to explain its meaning to prospective readers. Petrarch's figurations of *amor* and *patria* issue a direct appeal to each reader.[37] They elicit sympathy for the speaker as a victim who has sacrificed everything for his beloved and for the commune that he serves. In the prologue of his *Comento* Lorenzo turns to Petrarch to draw sympathy from his own audience. He indicates this purpose with a direct quotation from the first sonnet of Petrarch's *Rime sparse:* "spero trovar pietà, non che perdono" 'I hope to find compassion, not just forgiveness' (39).

Lorenzo cites the line twice. Petrarch boldly intends to earn pity as well as pardon. So too does Lorenzo, but with a gesture of self-abnegation in his humble reference to a superior poet. To Lorenzo, as also to Antonio da Tempo and Francesco Filelfo, Petrarch was a public figure. The northern Italian commentators had regarded the complexity of his love for Laura as a central issue in sonnet 1. Antonio questions whether it was an invented fiction, designed to illustrate some deeper truth, or whether it depicts an actual event in the poet's life, "sel Petrarcha scripse come poeta fingendo esser innamorato: ouero se da uera donna abagliato chiamata laureta" 'whether Petrarch wrote as a poet feigning to be in love or whether he was actually dazzled by a real woman named Laureta.' Although Antonio argues decisively for the latter—"& potrei darne proue assai" 'I could give abundant proof for it' (A6^{r})—he also asserts that poetry represents moral truth. Petrarch's love "e fundato sopra la uirtute & non patisse mutatione alcuna uana" 'is based upon virtue and doesn't undergo any vain change' (A7^{v}).

Filelfo locates his truth about Petrarch's poetry in principles of human behavior and especially those that suit a public figure in service to the state. Petrarch's initial sonnet is not the first that he wrote but, rather, the last, a poem

that tries to set the record straight: "Non fu perho il primo che lui facesse: ma lultimo di tutti. Il che principalmente mi par lui haver facto per puoter in qualche parte rimediare allinfamia: ne la quale presso linsensato Vulgo era cum varie calumnie incorso per lopinione de lamata Madonna Laura" 'It was however not the first poem that he wrote, but the last of all. It seems to me that he wrote it chiefly to be able in some way to repair his reputation from the infamy which it had incurred among the foolish populace through various calumnies.' Public figures such as Petrarch, or, for that matter, the leaders whom they counsel, always run the risk of ignoring public opinion, "il non curarci di quello ch altri di noi o extima o parla" 'not caring about what others think or say about us,' and of inflating themselves with arrogance, "perche siamo arroganti" 'because we are arrogant.' By using the first-person pronoun so conspicuously, Filelfo includes himself in this dismal image of public life. But Petrarch, he points out, avoided such peril by confessing his youthful errors: "Leximio e prudentissimo nostro poeta . . . si scusa nel suo havere scritto in amorose rime dimostrando tale errore esser proceduto da eta giovenile" 'Our esteemed and prudent poet . . . excuses himself for having written his amatory poetry by showing that such an error was the product of his youth' (1r). In so doing, Petrarch provides an illustrious example for those who may abnegate themselves in order to win the confidence of others.

This approach proves useful to Lorenzo. Whereas Antonio and Filelfo pursue it in relation to Petrarch's service with the Visconti, Lorenzo applies it directly to himself. Conscious of his role as a public figure, he uses the example of Petrarch to improve his own image. As Antonio and Filelfo had shown, Petrarch made himself a sympathetic object of contemplation in the gaze of others, securing their confidence and persuading them to his view of reality. So does Lorenzo, with the added benefit of claiming Petrarch's Florentine ancestry as a precedent for his own patriotism. He begins in diffidence about the worth of his topic. His love may not have been perfect, because perfection is rare; it was nonetheless worthy to be celebrated in Petrarch's style. If detractors cite flaws in his representation, he begs sympathy from readers who know the topic firsthand: "And if, even with all these arguments, I have not responded to all the accusations and calumnies of those who would wish to condemn me, at least, as our Florentine poet said in the company of those who had experienced what love is, 'I hope to find compassion, not just forgiveness'" (39).

Two paragraphs later Lorenzo cites Petrarch's verse again. Here the context registers the speaker's grave uneasiness about winning his audience's approval. He begins by referring to his well-known personal and political misfortunes at

the hands of enemies, tacitly identifying these misfortunes with the Pazzi conspiracy of 26 April 1478 and the conspiracy of Giovanni Battista Frescobaldi discovered on 2 June 1481.[38] Compassion ought to move his audience to pity him: "Compassion at least should vindicate me because, having in my youth been much persecuted by men and by fortune, some little solace ought not be denied me, and this I have only found in loving ardently and in composing and in commenting upon my verses." Still, Lorenzo knows that his audience will be divided in its political estimation: "Accordingly, I return to the abovementioned verse of our Florentine poet that, 'where there may be someone who understands love by experience' (both this love that I have so greatly praised, and some particular love and charity toward me), 'I hope to find compassion, not just forgiveness'" (43). In this stunning gesture of textual repetition, Lorenzo identifies Petrarch's plight with his own. Some readers may not support Lorenzo's political goals, and others may shed no tears for his political adversities, but all might understand his amatory misfortunes. Unlike the Petrarch of Antonio da Tempo and Filelfo, who defended the Milanese Visconti and their prestige, Lorenzo will defend himself and secure the prestige of Florence. Much of this prestige already resides in the literary language that Lorenzo derives from Petrarch. Even though Petrarch had never lived in Florence, his poetry tapped the style of such Florentines as Dante and Guido Cavalcanti, and it earned for Florence a cultural capital that Lorenzo can now draw upon. Its discourse serves him while he serves it, empowering his claim to leadership as one who gives himself over to—indeed, ritualistically sacrifices himself for—the beloved populace.[39] As Lorenzo bends this figuration to serve his needs, he presents it to the populace in an analysis of styles processed through Petrarch's composite language which represent the history of Florentine poetry *in parvo.*[40] Particularly when this poetry approaches autobiographical statement, Lorenzo channels its meaning through his commentary. It is as though in consolation he were displacing his experience onto his politics.[41]

Lorenzo repeats this sacrificial gesture throughout the *Comento.* Each time it assumes a poetic form for which the Petrarchan lyric supplies a model. In this self-dramatization Lorenzo attributes a spectacular victory if not to his political intelligence, at least to his rhetorical skill. Such skill is the mark of a ruler. It distinguishes him from the ruled, the leader from the led, in a republic that frowned upon nobility of birth as the sole criterion of rule, and it finally declares Lorenzo's link with Petrarch. In his commentary on sonnet 4 Lorenzo quotes from Petrarch's sonnet 15, Love's discourse about the lover's exemption from ordinary human constraints, "che questo è privilegio degli

amanti, / sciolti da tutte qualitati umane" 'that this is a privilege of lovers, released from all human qualities.' To explain Petrarch's poem, Filelfo and Antonio had imagined Petrarch's departure from Laura on a journey away from Avignon and her. Antonio da Tempo notes the speaker's grief: "Partendose M. F. da vignone dove era la sua M. L. fece questo S. dove molto se dole della partita como sel core suo se levasse del suo corpo" 'By claiming to leave Avignon where Laura lived, Petrarch fashions this sonnet in which he deeply laments his departure as if his heart were severed from his body' (B2^{v}). Filelfo speculates upon the occasion as a specific visit to Italy: "Dove essendosi gia partito da Vignone per tornare in Italia quanta fusse la sua ansieta per lamata donna cum dolce e non falso parlare dichiara in tal modo" 'Having already left Avignon to return to Italy, he declares the extent of his anxiety about his beloved in sweet and heartfelt speech' (22^{r}). In Filelfo's narrative Petrarch goes to Milan, enters Visconti employment, and does great public service, consequently sacrificing his private life with Laura. Laura was of course already dead when Petrarch entered Viscontian service in 1353, but the commentator nonetheless turns the event into a drama about the poet's commitment to his patrons.

Lorenzo exploits the metaphorical possibilities of this commitment. It furnishes a vehicle to express not just devotion to any temporal ruler but also a call to sacrifice one's personal interests to a transcendent polity. In giving himself to the republic, the speaker symbolically enacts the Petrarchan lover's self-abnegation in giving himself wholly to the beloved, while she in turn encourages him onward. In sonnet 14 the beloved's hand draws the bow that wounds and at the same time heals him:

> La vita e morte mia tenete voi,
> eburnee dita, e 'l gran disio ch'io celo,
> qual mai occhio mortal vedrà, né vide.
>
> You, ivory fingers, hold my life and death,
> And hold the great desire that I conceal,
> Which mortal eye has never seen nor shall.
> (127)

The topos refers to Petrarch's sonnet 159, in whose last stanza Love simultaneously heals and wounds. Here Petrarch evokes Plato's figure of love as a medicine that reconciles opposites in the soul: "Non sa come Amor sana e come ancide, / chi non sa come dolce ella sospira" 'He does not know how Love heals and how he kills, who does not know how sweetly she sighs.' The northern commentators understand this figure as ennobling the beloved. Antonio writes

that "nota questa ultima stantia esser suavissimo pensero haver de una donna" 'this last stanza stands out as the sweetest thought one could have about one's beloved' (F3^{v}). Squarzafico claims that its power resides in the human soul's divine origin: "Che vole lanime nostre havere la nostra prima similitudine i cielo" 'It means that our souls have their primary models in heaven' (I1^{r}).

For both commentators this divine origin validates the noble soul's virtuous action. Lorenzo makes this validation more specific. Commenting on sonnet 14, he traces the topos of cure to the mythic lance of Achilles which had the power to wound and heal at the same time: "It wounds then and heals, that is, it kindles desire and then fulfills it, as is said of the spear, that is the javelin of Achilles son of Peleus, which had two points, one that wounded, so the poets say, and one that healed the wounds" (129). Here the figure of the warrior blurs into that of the physician, the *medicus,* who functions as a prototype for the would-be ruler. Both figures find their apotheosis in the speaker's heroic self-sacrifice. Achilles faced the choice of living a long but undistinguished life or meeting an early death through which he would earn fame by offering himself to the public body.[42] Lorenzo ponders a similar choice, but the actuality of his position as a ruler amplifies the Milanese commentators' reading. Lorenzo's Petrarchan lover is doubly a *medicus,* the head of a family of Medici and a leader who dispenses a cure for his people.[43]

Lorenzo led Florence at a historical moment when he could identify his personal interests with those of the republic.[44] His rhetorical problem was to explain how his private design to get and hold power might coincide, or seem to coincide, with the civic need to build strong defenses against outside forces. One solution is to identify the private ruler with the public ruled.[45] Here the topos of love offers a dynamic poetic vehicle that serves to reconcile opposing forces and prepare the way for a higher form of order. Through this topos Lorenzo represents his service to the beloved—and to his readership—as an act of sacrifice and abnegation which makes him as worthy of the republic as the republic is of him. When the Petrarchan mode acquires such thematic weight, it becomes a relativized unstable barometer of a relativized unstable history. In Lorenzo's case it does so all the more after it has passed through the crucible of his own personal biography, fraught with its ambiguities, uncertainties, and indetermination. Lorenzo's use of the Petrarchan mode presages some important sixteenth-century developments—the competition with and turn from other poets, the turn toward radical introspection, the beckoning of stylistic semaphores that take on different shades and tones with each new performance—which were raised to higher levels of problematic art by later po-

ets. Whatever pressures of social unrest, political survival, and cultural stability the *Comento* may have charted for fifteenth-century Florence, it certainly helped to situate Petrarch as something he barely was—a Florentine poet.

Meanwhile, not just in Florence but throughout Italy Petrarch came to exemplify the values of *patria.* Nowhere did his citation appear more striking than in Naples, its kingdom under Spanish domination from the beginning of the sixteenth-century. And no poet in Naples cited Petrarch more strikingly than the émigré diplomat Benedetto Gareth (ca. 1450–1515), called "il Cariteo" (in a pun on *Gareth* > *Garetus* > *Garetteo* > *Cariteo*) by fellow members of Pontano's Neapolitan Academy. Cariteo was a Spaniard who in 1468 emigrated from Barcelona to Naples as it was entering its Golden Age.[46] He served under three Aragonese kings, first as keeper of the Royal Seal (1486–96) for Ferrante I and Alfonso II, then in that position and as prime minister (1495–96) for Ferrante II. Having suffered great personal losses when Charles VIII of France invaded the kingdom in 1495, he escaped to Rome before Louis XII ended Aragonese rule in Naples in 1501. After the Spanish supplanted the French in 1503, he returned to Naples, where he published some of his Petrarchan *Rime* in 1506 and all of them in a sequence entitled *Endimione* in 1509.[47] Under Spanish rule, however, he never regained the social or political prestige that he had enjoyed with the Aragonese kings. The promotion of Petrarch by a Spanish émigré as a standard for Italian poetry in Naples resounds with unavoidably patriotic overtones associated with the poet's *patria* in relation to his local or regional adoptive milieu.[48]

Endimione is a carefully organized sequence of 214 sonnets, 20 canzoni, 5 sestine, 5 ballate, and 3 madrigals.[49] It pursues a clear narrative line more readily tied to the author's literary and biographical development than earlier sequences, including those of Boccaccio or Lorenzo de' Medici. Its speaker's name is Endimione, and the beloved's is Luna. Its first half (up to canzone 10) narrates the lover's frustrations in a recall of themes, motifs, and dramatic situations from Horace, Ovid, Catullus, Tibullus, and especially Propertius.[50] The next quarter (beginning at sonnet 116) narrates the speaker's loss of his beloved, not through her death, as in Petrarch, but through her marriage to another and her departure for Spain. Afterward the speaker becomes more and more involved with political affairs. Stifling his regret for Luna, or just simply forgetting about her, he soon busies himself with writing panegyrics about Naples and its courtly society. It is as though the beloved's departure requires him to seek out new topics for his poetry—to become, in effect, a new kind of poet.[51] Canzone 15 establishes a chronology by marking 1502 as the tenth

anniversary of her departure, an anniversary that occurs ten months after the collapse of Naples' Aragonese monarchy. The decade had seen the death of King Ferrante I in 1494, the abdication of the latter's son and successor Alfonso II on 23 January 1495, an invasion of the French in February 1495, the death of Alfonso's successor Ferrante II on 7 October 1496, and a second French invasion on 4 August 1501 which forced King Federigo into exile in Anjou and the poet to asylum in Rome.[52]

The final quarter of *Endimione* (from sonnet 165 onward) unfolds after 1502 and is entirely nonamatory. The Spanish wrest Naples from the French in 1503, and the speaker returns to the city. As he reenters a court whose rules have changed with its form of government, he now addresses friends and associates who have managed to retain their rank in the new regime.[53] Cariteo's Petrarchan surface, however, must have seemed strange to his Neapolitan audience, especially after the Spanish installation, when a retreat to classical style and the emulation of classical forms came to dominate the aristocratic culture of the old Neapolitan nobility.[54] Very much involved in the politics of the new court and its Spanish dominators, Cariteo exercised his talent in an Italian literary vernacular rather than Latin, despite his nonnative grasp of the former and his humanist ease with the latter. Obviously, he could have written in an Aragonese dialect, too, but that would not have helped the Spanish ruling class to legitimize its relationship to a preexistent Neapolitan court culture.[55] His Petrarchism performs a facilitating role, then, which enables the Spanish viceregal government to insert itself into a new vernacular environment by absorbing what it can from a northern Italian court culture.[56]

Endimione carefully displays Cariteo's resourcefulness, dramatizing the hopes and illusions of a lover in the last troubled days of the dying monarchy. Its classical and Petrarchan motifs converge in the poet's use of the Roman elegiac models that he shares with Petrarch. In an elegy that anticipates Cariteo's anxiety about Luna's marriage to a Spaniard, Propertius laments Cynthia's marriage to an Illyrian: "ut sine me vento quolibet ire velis" 'without me you sail under the first wind' (1.8.4). For Propertius, Cynthia is a figure of the moon, and her movement (*errare*) away from the speaker generates his complaint. For Cariteo the name Luna recalls Propertius' Cynthia, but its paronomastic identification with *l'una* (the one), in the manner of Petrarch's identification of Laura with *lauro* (laurel), *l'aura* (the breeze), and *l'oro* (gold), suggests another metonymy.[57] It implies Luna/*l'una*'s provisional opposition to the world of the many and its ambient disorder. As *L'una,* the One, the beloved is immune to change. As *Luna,* the Moon, however, the beloved presides over a

realm of change. By following her course of action "che con dolce errore / Rivolve la mia vita" 'that with a sweet errancy overturns my life' (21–22), Cariteo's speaker is drawn into an orbit that portends nothing but disaster. The complete cycle of 247 poems divides into three parts, the first half dominated by the amatory motif of the speaker's Petrarchan love for Luna, the next quarter narrating her departure from him, and the last quarter detailing his subsequent involvement in Neapolitan history. This structure adumbrates the one that Vellutello would confer upon Petrarch's *Rime sparse* when he rearranged the order of poems into three distinct parts: poems *in vita di Laura,* poems *in morte di Laura,* and poems in testimony of Petrarch's public life and political concerns. I would argue that Cariteo attempts something similar. The three parts of *Endimione* constitute fictive enactments of his own private and public life, reflecting tides of change in Naples' historical destiny.

Sonnet 146, for example, expressly conflates the amatory with the political in its double lament for the loss of Luna and the death of King Ferrante I. Its octave contrasts the sorrow that Naples feels after Luna's departure with the happiness that Spain enjoys upon her arrival: "Quanto del proprio mal si duole & lagna / . . . Tanto s'allegra la felice Hispagna" 'As much as Naples suffers and laments its own unhappiness, so happy Spain rejoices.' The sestet then affirms that the king's recent death can hardly inflict more woe, since Luna's departure has already impoverished Naples:

> Onde 'l signor del regno & di fortuna,
> Volando al ciel, lasciò là minor gloria,
> Poi ch'era Napol senza la mia Luna.
> Nè tanto l'altro Re de sua vittoria
> Contra gente Africana, oscura & bruna,
> Quanto d'una tal luce, hoggi si gloria.

> Whence the lord of this kingdom and its fortune, flying to heaven, left behind a diminished glory since Naples remained without my Luna. Nor did the other king [Ferdinand] bask in his victory [at Granada] against the dark and swarthy Africans as much as he did in Luna's light.

Although this encomiastic gesture celebrates Luna, its vehicle of comparison evokes Ferdinand the Catholic's expulsion of the Moors from Granada in 1492, and it extols Spain's sovereignty in Iberia. As it also happens, Ferdinand's military strategist at Granada was Gonsalvo de Córdoba, Spain's victor over the French at the Battle of Garigliano in 1502 and the first viceroy of Naples in 1504.[58] Cariteo's nod toward Ferdinand and Granada is also a bow toward Gonsalvo and his installation as viceroy.

In my view this Petrarchan turn inaugurates the poet's testimonial to the new regime. It affords a transitional space, allowing him, on the one hand, to connect his poetic expression with a northern Italian literary culture and, on the other, to proclaim his adoptive Neapolitan political identity as a Spanish émigré.[59] Before the French and Spanish invasions of Naples, Cariteo's skill in echoing the Petrarchan style allowed him to appropriate the literary greatness of Tuscany and to advance Naples' literary culture.[60] After the collapse of the Aragonese monarchy it provides him with a means to ingratiate his new masters and endorse their rule. That he shares their Spanish birth affords a parallel with Petrarch. For Antonio da Tempo, Filelfo, and Squarzafico, Petrarch was of Florentine parentage but was raised in Avignon and spent his early adulthood as a protégé of French popes: his service to the Visconti in Milan marked a return to his Italian heritage. So too with Cariteo, who was of Spanish origin but who spent his entire adulthood in Naples. His current bow to the Spanish viceroy marks his return to Spanish political service, now in the name of a different culture that he can link to the heritage of central and northern Italy.[61]

Canzone 17 dramatizes Cariteo's options by referring to a powerful political model, Petrarch's canzone 128. Although Cariteo's poem honors the Aragonese dynasty, it honors even more the idea of an emergent centralizing authority that the Spanish viceregal government asserted after 1503.[62] It commemorates Aragonese rule as a useful but distant precedent that the viceroy now fulfills, just as Petrarch's canzone 128 had sketched an Italian history that later commentators saw as a figural forecast of events in their lifetime. Cariteo's poem opens with a pastiche of words, phrases, and quotations from Petrarch's model, exactly replicating the latter's stanzaic pattern (*AbCBaCcDEeDDfGfG*):

> Quale odio, qual furor, qual ira immane,
> Quai pianete maligni
> Han vostre voglie, unite, hor si divise?
> (1–3)

What hatred, what fury, what monstrous ire, what malignant planets have now divided your once united wills?

As in Petrarch's poem the speaker urges unity against an aggressive foe. His addressee is an Italian ruler who holds the fate of the peninsula in his power. Cariteo does not name this ruler, but evidence points to Ludovico il Moro of Milan, who on 21 October 1494 summoned King Charles VIII of France to in-

vade Italy, precipitating later invasions against Milan in 1499, leading to the overthrow of Ludovico in 1500, and then against Naples in the summer of 1501.[63] Even after Spain's victory over France in 1503, the threat persisted, motivating the Holy League of Spain, Venice, England, and the papacy against France in 1511. Not until the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis in 1559 would French designs end. From Cariteo's perspective the security of Naples and the rest of Italy depends on Spanish strength.[64]

The poem's third stanza focuses on French aggression. A stunning commercial metaphor questions the strength of foreign leagues and partnerships:

> Quanto mal può sperarsi ogni momento
> Da liga o compagnia
> Di cui lo proprio honor vende & rivende.
> (36–38)

How poorly can we trust any moment of league or partnership with one who sells and retails his own honor?

A brutal figure of the French monarch as an uncontrollable wolf underscores the dangerous game that Ludovico il Moro plays with the fortunes of foreign powers: "Che per l'orecchi tene un lupo inico, / Che 'l lasciar nè 'l tener non gli è securo" 'That he holds by the ears an enemy wolf, and that neither letting go nor holding tight is safe for him' (40–41).[65] His motivation is lust for power, "l'infinito ardore / D'imperio" 'the infinite craving for power' (58–59), an imperium figured in Petrarch's canzone 128 as a hollow name, a word that some have made an idol, "un nome / vano, senza soggetto" 'an empty name without substance' (128.76–77). Filelfo comments that here Petrarch mocks the very idea of political power: "Il Petrarca se ne ride e fassene beffe" 'Petrarch scoffs at it and derides it' (128^{v}), while Antonio da Tempo describes a context of civil strife which parallels Cariteo's own situation: "Questa morale fece M. F. contra li segnori de italia che in questo tempo erano tutti in guerra" 'Petrarch fashions this moral warning against the lords of Italy who at this time were all at war against one another' (C6^{r}). According to both commentators, internal conflict proves more destructive than external invasion, and to remedy it Petrarch urges adjustment, accommodation, and reconciliation.

Cariteo emulates this Petrarchan figure of poet and public servant as a voice of conscience and moral authority.[66] His final stanza now evokes the haunting conclusion of Petrarch's model, "I' vo gridando: Pace, pace, pace" 'I go crying: Peace, peace, peace' (128.122), expanding Petrarch's anaphora into a hortatory address:

> Ai, pace!, ai, ben!, di buon si desiato! . . .
> Et in questo amenissimo terreno
> Di Napol, dove 'l cielo è più sereno,
> Ferma i tuoi piedi gravi. (97, 107–9)

O peace, o good so desired by the good, . . . in this most agreeable land of Naples where heaven is most serene, plant your feet deep.

As the abstract nouns suggest, chances for peace after 1503 no longer hinged upon the means available against Ludovico il Moro or France's Charles VIII in 1494. The Aragonese king has abdicated, both heirs have died, and the kingdom has passed to a Spanish viceroy who was the only leader strong enough to thwart French ambitions. Conciliation with Spain represents Naples'—and Italy's—best hope for stability and security. In its exalted language Petrarch's call to peace adumbrates Cariteo's call for a coalition of power among Naples, Italy, and Spain. By displacing the temporality of the poem's action, this call proposes an illusionary timeless view of civil order which rises above partisan politics.

Cariteo published his Petrarchan *Endimione* in 1509 as a gesture of his willingness to comply with the new state. Certainly in the first printed editions of Petrarch from 1476 to 1503, the northern commentators had represented Petrarch as the paradigm of a loyal monarchist, not at all the Florentine republican depicted in Leonardo Bruni's *Vita di Petrarca.* The political pragmatism and pan-Italian spirit of Antonio's and Filelfo's Petrarch are what Cariteo would situate in his adoptive Naples. Gonsalvo de Córdoba, the viceroy, paid some attention to the poet in March 1504 by nominating him to serve as governor of Nola and in July 1504 by reinstating his pension of three hundred ducats.[67] Nothing else indicates, however, that by the time Cariteo died in 1515 he had received further public recognition.

Cariteo's Petrarchism nonetheless took root in Naples as a literary language to be cultivated in the mannerist styles of Angelo di Costanzo (1507–91), Luigi Tansillo (1520–53), Galeazzo di Tàrsia (1520–53), Bernardo Tasso (1493–1569), and Torquato Tasso (1544–95), and others who succeeded them.[68] It conferred on the Neapolitan court an Italian cultural identity to which the Spanish aristocracy assimilated. Because this show of patriotic spirit helped to whet Naples's opposition to another foreign claimant, France, who pursued its goals in Italy until 1559, the Spanish government even encouraged the expansion of a pan-Italian discourse in the Neapolitan Academy.[69] Cariteo's vernacular poetry served the viceroy's purposes only briefly, however. Although several in-

complete editions of the *Rime* were published at Venice in succeeding years, no edition appeared in Naples after 1509. Posterity can be hard on those who serve their own times too well, and Cariteo's work surely exemplifies the efforts of a poet who tried to please contemporaries across the spectrum. Largely and unfairly ignored in the canon of sixteenth-century Petrarchism, it also exemplifies Petrarchism's adaptation to a new site of cultural and political engagement. Broadening the site of Petrarchism, it signals the conflation of lyric discourse with a rise of a newly professed national sentiment.

This page intentionally left blank

4 *Du Bellay and the Language of Empire*

The *Deffence et illustration*

The life of Joachim Du Bellay (ca. 1522?–60) was nearly coterminous with that of Charles V's phantom Holy Roman Empire (1519–56), so it is not surprising to find overt and covert figurations of nation and empire in his poetry.[1] *Les Regrets, Les Antiquitez de Rome* and *Songe* and the Neo-Latin *Poemata,* all published in 1558, evoke Rome's ancient empire with haunting echoes from the Augustan poets—from Virgil, Horace, and Ovid in particular.[2] These Latin poets projected highly conflicted, deeply compromised attitudes about Octavius' rule. Virgil saw in Rome's antiquity the seeds of its imperial greatness but also signs of its decay. Horace acknowledged the olive branch of tranquillity and civilization proffered by Octavius but also an inner emptiness in Augustan pageantry and flourish. Ovid in a regretful exile could only ponder his missteps as an imperial poet. Yet another poet—and for Du Bellay's vernacular ambitions a still more significant one—confronted similar conflicts and resulting compromises. It was Petrarch.

With an exilic consciousness fixated upon the totemic power of Italy and its imperial legacy, Petrarch had shaped a version of his national identity which fantasized grander origins and a more exalted destiny than reality allowed. Later commentators viewed his love for Laura as a projection of this fantasy, and Du Bellay's poetry resonates with their speculations. His sonnets become vehicles for expressing a national sentiment grounded in personal loyalties to friends and associates of the same status, rank, or class. They address an audience already familiar with the *Rime sparse,* readers defined by their strong ties to Italian culture and their desire for a national French culture to match the

latter. It is an audience of aristocratic patrons, court councillors, and rival poets who as public figures often loom larger in Du Bellay's plan than the beloved of his Petrarchan imagination.[3] *The Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse* (licensed 15 February 1549) rallies such readers, and *Olive, L'Anterotique,* and the *Vers lyriques* (licensed 20 March 1549 and published with the *Deffence* the following April) offer models for imitation. Petrarch's figurations leave an imprint upon *Olive* and *Sonnets d'honneste amour* (1552), surely, but also upon *Les Regrets, Les Antiquitez de Rome,* and *Songe,* in which a sense of historical destiny inhabits Petrarchan tropes. Du Bellay crafts these sequences to affirm his social and professional allegiances, to announce a concept of civility whose spokesman he would become, to recall parallels in the past and present, and to demonstrate a rhetorical expertise that might help to transform an expanding monarchy into a state and this state into a nation.

The program of the *Deffence* focuses upon the interests of a stratified nobility whose precise roles in the emerging nation still lacked clear definition.[4] By the end of the Hundred Years War in 1460 the old military nobility had suffered economic and social impoverishment.[5] The Italian campaigns of 1494–1559 enabled many noblemen to recuperate lost ground, despite advances in technology which had made chivalric warfare obsolete.[6] After 1535 François I began to appoint princes of the blood to advisory positions in his inner council. In turning to the great families of Montmorency, Bourbon, and Guise, lords of territories at the nation's military frontiers, he upgraded the policies of Louis XII, who had staffed his council with astute commoners trained in law and the *artes dictaminis.*[7] The military nobility welcomed such appointments.[8] Barred from commercial activities to preserve its exemption from taxation, its members sought new routes to prosperity through court service.

So too did the lesser provincial nobility, in which Joachim Du Bellay was born. Orphaned at an early age and chronically impoverished, the poet emerged from the cadet branch of a prestigious Angevine family that had bred Cardinals Guillaume and Jean du Bellay to serve as François's trusted national advisors.[9] Throughout his career Du Bellay used these connections to gain a foothold at court. In their new positions at regional parlements or at court, diffuse ranks of the elite came into competition with upwardly mobile gentry and bourgeoisie.[10] The latter had acquired notarial training in the schools and legal training in the universities, which noblemen rarely attended.[11] Some form of education for the lesser nobility might now make a difference for those among its members who did not have access to appointments bestowed upon the *grands seigneurs.* In effect, such a pursuit of learning might pit the

lesser nobility against untitled competitors who had depended upon routine schooling to rise through the ranks. A distinguishing strategy for such noblemen would be to cultivate a special kind of education, a hypothetically superior one modeled on the humanist programs of northern Italy.

Joachim Du Bellay showed the way. In 1545–47 he had enrolled in judicial studies at the University of Poitiers with the likely goal of entering diplomatic service, and in 1547–48 he studied with the Limousin humanist Jean Dorat at the Collège de Coqueret in Paris, perhaps to polish his linguistic and rhetorical skills for an emissary post.[12] Opportunities beckoned. The virtual annexation of the Piedmont by France between 1536–59 made that region of northern Italy a focus of aspiration for young careerists, just as the French Crown's negotiations with the papacy on matters concerning Charles V and the Council of Trent made Rome another focus.[13] Upon Henri II's ascent to the throne in May 1547, the new king expanded the number of prestigious offices of state to which noblemen might aspire.[14] In his preface to the second edition of *Olive* Du Bellay gives every indication of planning to use his education and family connections to best advantage: "J'ayme la poësie, . . . mais je n'y suis tant affecté, que facilement je ne m'en retire, si la fortune me veut presenter quelque chose, où avecques plus grand fruict je puisse occuper mon esprit" 'I love poetry, . . . but I am not so much enamored of it that I would not withdraw in a moment if fortune should afford me an opportunity in which I could engage my wit far more fruitfully.'[15] He definitely sought something more than a gimcrack appointment in the depths of Henri II's growing bureaucracy.

The genius of Du Bellay's argument for a conjoined classical and vernacular education in the *Deffence* is that it could, and by the end of the sixteenth century it actually did, appeal to a new courtly nobility as a means of affirming its fitness for service to the nation-state. Such an education, now construed as a mark of culture and refinement, would set its noble recipients apart from those whose training in the *ars dictaminis* imparted merely functional skills. It was a form of education which might distinguish patrician from pedestrian at a time of rapid social transformation.[16] It would surely distinguish courtly members of the *noblesse de robe* from the military caste of the *noblesse de race,* whose members simply did not possess or need a formal education and who actively scorned one.[17] A sense of this distinction marks Du Bellay's transfer from ordinary legal studies at the University of Poitiers to exceptional classical pursuits at the Collège de Coqueret, and it may have provided an example for Ronsard and eventually other members of the Pléiade who joined him.[18]

The distinctive quality of this education was its dual insistence on a mastery of the classical curriculum and on a broad vernacular learning. The pedantic rigor of parsing Latin and Greek might discipline minds for skills of management and organization, while training in modern languages could hone rhetorical skills, impart social graces, and shape a cultural style.[19] These benefits, along with those of enabling young noblemen to forge personal ties in schools and academies designed for them, would create networks to enhance future opportunities and foster a sense of class solidarity. They would also contribute to the formation of a national culture. As Du Bellay understood, the spread of a courtly culture and its vernacular might extend the hand of the monarchy even to the margins of popular culture.[20] With a long-familiar pun on the name of the late king (*François* [Francis, Frenchman]) *Deffence* 1.3 links the emergence of a French literary discourse to the succession of the monarchy, "que nostre Langue (si avecques Francoys n'est du tout ensevelie la Langue Francoyse) qui commence encor' à jeter ses racines, sortira de terre, & s'elevera en telle hauteur & grosseur" 'when our language (if with Francis the whole French language will not be buried), which now begins to throw out its roots, will emerge from the ground and rise to such height and greatness' (27/28).[21] Assuaging rivalries within the social order, this confluence of language, king, and nation would confer a new sense of corporate identity upon France.

Late medieval France had based its idea of civic collectivity upon a shared allegiance to the French king and the Christian religion. This collectivity readily acknowledged its tribal patchwork of multicultural ethnic origins, stemming from mixed strands of Celts, Gauls, Bretons, non-Indo-European Aquitani, Romans, Greeks, Germanic Franks, Visigoths, Burgundians, Norsemen, and others.[22] What united the French kingdom beyond its religion was a set of common goals and the desire of its people to live together. Sixteenth-century heterodoxy put an end to the idea that Christianity might confer a sense of national unity as the Crown, the Gallican Church, Sorbonne conservatives, the ultramontane Catholic nobility, and Huguenot reformers each vented sectarian beliefs. Amid doctrinal chaos the single shared characteristic of French identity was now a predominantly secular culture available to all who wished to be or become French, regardless of ethnic origin or religious affiliation. The subsequent Wars of Religion between 1559 and 1598 sealed the idea of national identity as a secular phenomenon by raising skepticism about the nature of God's plan as defined by contending religious groups, investing such confidence in the state and nation instead of in religion.[23] Michel de l'Hôpital

stated the principle succinctly when he declared the state accessible to Protestants as well as Catholics, to Jews and Turks as well as Christians.[24]

In Du Bellay's era the word *French* sported several etymologies. The late-thirteenth-century *Grandes chroniques de France* asserted its derivation from that of the "Franks," similar to Germanic *franc* (ferocious, barbarous).[25] In 1450 Bernard du Rosier repeated fanciful allegations by the seventh-century chronicler Fredegar about *franc* meaning "free" (from Latin *fractum* [broken off, detached], cf. Greek *phragma* [an independent unit, a free entity]), proclaiming the exemption of the ancient Franks from Roman law and hence the immunity of medieval Francia from demands made by the Holy Roman Empire.[26] This idea of freedom from foreign domination fueled French national resistance to England's lien upon its Crown during the Hundred Years War, just as in the sixteenth century it propelled Gallican resistance to containment by the Roman papacy. In Du Bellay's youth the long struggle against Charles V's Roman Empire encouraged even poor peasants to thinks of themselves as "French" in opposition to the imperial Spanish, Italian, or Germanic Other.[27] Embroidered around this etymology was the Hellenic myth of Francus, Hector's imputed son, the eponymous founder of the Frankish people who conferred a Greco-Trojan pedigree upon the nation's origin, usurping its links to Roman or Germanic history.[28] In 1511 Jean Lemaire de Belges took the further step of suggesting a parthenogenic origin by proposing that the Greeks themselves were the ancient offspring of Celtic colonists who had moved eastward from Gaul to the Aegean coast in the second millennium B.C.E. and then backward with Francus after the Trojan War to what would become the site of modern France.[29]

Other myths emphasized France's religious preeminence in medieval Christendom. Clovis's conversion from heathendom on the eve of his victory over Frankish rivals, Charles Martel's defeat of the Spanish Saracens at Tours, Charlemagne's campaigns against the Moors in the Pyrenees, Hugh Capet's millennial leadership, and St. Louis' sponsorship of crusades to the Holy Land secured for French monarchs the title of *Rex Christianissimus* (Most Christian King), a title that Philip the Fair revived in 1296 to wrest control of the French Church from the papacy of Boniface VIII.[30] It was a title that François I and Henri II bore proudly, reinforcing it with yet another ancient slogan, "Le roy est empereur en son royaume" 'The king is emperor in his own kingdom,' whose currency bolstered their rule over territories secured by Louis XI, including Gascony, Burgundy, Provence, Anjou, Orleans, Brittany, Bourbon, and Auvergne.[31] Although Valois policy respected regional rights and custom-

ary local law, its machinery of state with a network of commissioners, public officers, provincial courts, and semiautonomous municipal governments helped to check the power of territorial magnates.[32] This centralizing policy represented—at least to Claude Seyssel and Etienne Pasquier—a liberating, not a repressive force, one that countered the tyranny and autocracy of provincial lords, "because with all their great authority and power [kings] are willing to be subject to their own laws and live according to them."[33]

The nomadic movement of the royal court throughout the Île-de-France and the Loire Valley in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries helped to fortify the Crown's user-friendly connection with the populace. After his return from Spanish captivity in 1526, however, François began to think about fashioning a specifically Parisian culture, one that could sow seeds for national accomplishment in arts and letters. In March 1530 he established the Collège des Lecteurs Royaux to promote the study of classical languages and culture.[34] In 1539 he licensed Robert Estienne to set up a commercial press to supersede the Sorbonne's academic publications. And in 1546 he appointed Lescot to redesign the Louvre as a permanent palace. Nor was the shadow of Charles V's imperial rule far from the French king's public ambitions. To diminish the iconic power of Charles's empire, both François and Henri increasingly brought imperial trappings to the rituals and ceremonies associated with their monarchy. Each avouched the Holy Roman inheritance of Charlemagne. As early as 1519, François put forth his direct candidacy for imperial title, while as late as 1551 French agents for Henri II were conducting talks with German princes for him to take over Metz, Toul, and Verdun as imperial vicar.[35]

To establish a new vernacular literature for this imperializing Valois culture, Du Bellay found inspiration in Petrarchan poetry. Petrarch himself had evolved his style in the waning days of the later medieval empire amid social change and political disruption that his fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentators variously recounted. Du Bellay would promote this style under the banner of a strong national monarch, a cohesive and supportive court aristocracy, an actively mobilized professional class, and an industrious, educated bourgeoisie. He and his associates would display it as an emblem of their loyalties to one another while contributing to the formation of a national sentiment far more effectively than any abstract allegiances to yet formative institutions of state and emblems of rule. The very title of Du Bellay's first collection of sonnets points to this goal. Without discounting the possibility that the name *Olive* refers to the personal emblem of the king's sister, Marguerite de France, marking the poet's aggressive bid for her patronage, or that

it constitutes an anagram for the name of a real or hypothetical beloved (the putative Mme or Mlle de Viole), the title surely evokes Athena's sacred branch.[36] In Petrarch's sonnet 24 a reference to Minerva as "l'inventrice de le prime olive" 'cultivator of the first olives' summons the olive wreath as the ancients' symbol for the work of human culture and imagination. Sixteenth-century commentators on the *Rime sparse* extend its implications. Vellutello, for example, recounts the origin of the poem's "bella fronduta, e fruttifera oliua" 'beautiful tree bearing olives' as an emblem for the rise of Athenian civilization and its enlargement throughout the world (135^{v}). So too does Du Bellay imply the beginnings of a new French culture and its potential spread.

An important precedent existed in the rise of Spanish national identity. It occurred with the expansion of a Iberian bureaucratic state to govern the sprawling empire that Charles V had inherited. His realm was a complicated patchwork of noncontiguous fiefs, which themselves were punctuated with enclaves belonging to other lords.[37] Born at Dijon in 1500 and raised in Ghent, the Francophone Charles V thought himself a Burgundian in sentiment, whence his animus against the French monarchy for its claims on that territory. His rule extended over Castile (from his maternal grandmother), Aragon and Naples (from his maternal grandfather), the Low Countries (from his paternal grandmother), the Hapsburg Succession (from his paternal grandfather), and recent Spanish conquests in the New World. To strengthen Spain, he established the seat of his migrant administration there in 1522. Diminishing the influence of Castilian grandees, heightening the participation of Aragonese aristocracy and *conversos,* and manipulating an already highly articulated sense of pure-blood Spanish ethnic identity, Charles appointed a mobile Consejo de Estado (State Council) dominated by advisors with strong national feelings.[38]

The creation of a literary and linguistic identity also shaped a sense of Spain. On 30 March 1543 the Barcelonan printer Garles Amoros issued *Las obras de Boscán y algunas de Garcilaso de la Vega* with a notice of its *privilegio imperiali* on the title page. Juan Boscán (ca. 1490–1542), its principal author, had died a few months earlier, just after assembling three books of his own poetry with a fourth book by his deceased friend, Garcilaso de la Vega (1503–36).[39] Boscán's selections include conventional *coplas, villancicos, canciones,* and the epyllionic *Leandro y Hero* but also ninety-two *sonetos* and ten Petrarchan *canciones.* The prologue to Boscán's *libro segundo* defends his Castilian imitations of Petrarch as augurs of a literary standard for Charles V's Spanish Empire. Boscán recounts his conversations in 1526 at Granada with

the Venetian humanist (and translator of Castiglione) Andreas Navagero and the latter's encouragement "átentar este género de verso" 'to attempt this kind of verse' (169).[40] It also recounts the decisive role of Garcilaso and "su juicio" 'his critical judgment' (170) in valuing Petrarch.[41] As the author points out, Petrarch sought models for himself in the work of Dante and the Provençal poets, "cuyas obras, por culpa de los tiempos, andan en pocas manos" 'whose works, through the fault of these times, circulate through few hands.' To Provençal models Spanish poets may lay even stronger claims than either Dante or Petrarch. Boscán, a bilingual Catalan and Castilian-speaking member of Barcelona's upper middle class, cites Provençal influence on Catalan poetry, and especially on the lyrics of Ausias March (ca. 1395–ca. 1460): "Destos Proenzales salieron muchos autores ecelentes Catalanes. De los quales el más ecelente es Osias March" 'From these Provençal poets descended many excellent Catalan authors. Of them the most excellent was Ausias March' (171). According to this logic, Petrarch's achievement might seem a historical accident. Any heir to the Provençals, whether Italian, French, Catalan, or Castilian, might have accomplished as much. In any case the Spanish poets now surpass all others. As the future belongs to them, disenfranchised Italians may well envy Spain: "Podrá ser que ántes de mucho se duelan los Italianos de ver lo bueno de su poesía transferido en Espana" 'It could be that before long the Italians might complain about seeing the excellence of their poetry transferred to Spain' (172).

By including Provençal poets in his genealogy, Boscán effects a *translatio studii* from Italy through southern France to Aragon and Castile, shadowing the *translatio imperii* of Charles V's empire from Rome to Spain.[42] To reinforce his argument, he appends texts by Garcilaso de la Vega, a poet with whom he competes on several grounds, including that of social status. Descended from Castilian nobility of Toledo, Garcilaso fought with the king against the Comuneros and later distinguished himself against the Ottomans at Rhodes and Tunis and against the French in northern Italy and southern France, where he was killed near Fréjus. Regarded as an aristocrat, a soldier-scholar of great distinction, and superior in rank to Boscán, Garcilaso personified the ascendancy of Spain's nobility in arms and letters. Academicians at Salamanca and Alcalá would canonize his poetry as the national equivalent of Petrarch's, and Francisco Sánchez de la Brozas ("El Brocense") (1574), Fernando de Herrera (1580), and Tomás Tamayo de Vargas (1622) would republish it with important commentaries.[43]

Garcilaso's sonnet 17, "Pensando que'l camino yva derecho" 'Thinking that

the road went straight,' typifies his Petrarchan style with clear echoes from at the end of the second quatrain and in the first tercet:

> Y duro campo de batalla el lecho.
> Del sueno, si ay alguno, aquella parte
> sola ques ser imagen de la muerte
> se aviene con el alma fatigada.[44]

And my bed a harsh battlefield. Of my dream, if there is any, that part alone which is the image of death adapts itself to my tired soul.

Petrarch's sonnet 226 corresponds exactly: "Et duro campo di battaglia il letto. / Il sonno è veramente, qual uom dice, / parente de la morte" 'And my bed is a harsh battlefield. Sleep is truly, as they say, akin to death.'

In his commentary on this poem Vellutello makes three pertinent observations. The first is that its opening verse, "Passer mai solitario in alcun tetto" 'No sparrow was ever so alone on any roof,' echoes Psalm 102, "Imitando il Propheta nel psalmo" 'Imitating the prophet in that Psalm.' The second is that the figure of sleep as death echoes Virgil, Seneca, and Ovid: "Onde Vir. nel sesto, Tum consanguineus laeti sopor, Et Seneca, Frater durae languide mortis, Et Oui. Stulte quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago" 'Whence Virgil in *Aeneid* 6.278, "Death's blood brother Sleep," and Seneca, "the languid brother of cruel death," and Ovid, "Fool, what is sleep, if not the image of icy death?"' The third is that its concluding tercet expresses the poet's patriotic pride in the region where Laura lives, "lodando le sue verdi riue, le fiorite & ombrose piagge" 'praising its green banks and its flowering and shady meadows' (83[r]). Petrarch's use of Scripture, the Latin classics, and patriotic sentiment casts an irresistible spell upon Garcilaso, and it is no wonder that he imitates the Italian poet, locating the model upon his own map of Spanish literary production.

Six years after the publication of Boscán's and Garcilaso's *Obras,* Du Bellay initiated his project in France. Complicating it in my view were the structures of class difference which marked earlier French literature. It was not sufficient for Du Bellay to urge or even set an example for a national literature. French literary history had already eulogized certain older texts that figured a national standard. Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun's alternately courtly and clerkly portions of the *Roman de la rose,* Guillaume de Machaut's virtuoso fixed-form lyrics, Alain Chartier's patriotic pamphlet *Quadrilogue invective,* and François Villon's earthy *Testament,* among other candidates, all earned some claim to this standard, but to Du Bellay each now carried the taint of outmoded value. To varying degrees, that is, each inscribed the vintage codes

of a superannuated feudal (Guillaume de Lorris), clerical (Jean de Meun), moralizing (Machaut), military (Chartier), or demimondaine (Villon) order. Du Bellay henceforth promotes a new literary discourse that would draw upon a reservoir of memory and experience closer to ideas of *patria* and nation evolving in his time. The *Deffence et illustration* announces this project, and the poetry accompanying it in the two editions of *Olive* (April 1549, October 1550) exemplifies it.

Paradoxically, Du Bellay's emphasis on strengthening the national vernacular derives from his deep immersion in ancient classical culture, a legacy from Jean Dorat, his teacher of Greek.[45] Dorat composed in Greek elegiacs a commendatory poem for the *Deffence,* an homage to Du Bellay's knowledge of Homeric style and to his will to apply such knowledge to the benefit of the Crown. He develops the poem as a gloss upon Homer's "Heis oiōnòs áristos amúnesthai perì pátrēs" 'One augury is best: to fight in defense of our country' (*Iliad* 12.243). His reworking of this line equates Du Bellay's defense of the vernacular, "amúnesthai perì glōttēs" 'to defend a language,' with the Homeric defense of the fatherland, "amúnesthai perì pátrēs" 'to defend a fatherland.' Du Bellay is a type of patriot, "philopátros anēr" 'a man who loves his country,' no less than his noble ancestors, "prógonoi philotátrides ándres" 'progenitors of one who loves his country.' The latter earned their reputation by wielding the sword in defense of the nation, "patríēs . . . péri marnámenoi" 'to fight . . . on behalf of the fatherland.' Du Bellay will earn his by wielding the pen in defense of the nation's language, "patríēs . . . perì glōttēs" 'to fight . . . on behalf of a language' (10/18). In the modern bureaucratic state the pen counts as much as the sword and proves an instrument as worthy of noble attention as weaponry in the past. The poem's grammatical parallelisms reinforce this lesson as a putatively timeless one, enabling both Dorat and Du Bellay to claim Homer for the present age. The profession of letters by an aristocratic poet will accomplish for his generation what the profession of arms did for an earlier age, binding the members of his elite community against foreign competition.[46]

A controversy attending the publication of the *Deffence* and *Olive* makes visible the social dimension of Du Bellay's argument and especially the class structure implied in its literary preferences. The critic who addressed Du Bellay in the celebrated *Quintil horacien* hid behind anonymity as he appended his tract to the second edition (1551) of Thomas Sebillet's *Art poétique français* (also published anonymously) and aligned his theoretical views with the latter's.[47] Internal references to translations of Horace's *ars poetica* enable us to

identify the author as Barthélemy Aneau (1505–61), principal of the distinguished Collège de la Trinité at Lyon. The title of his tract evokes the name of Quintilius, Horace's friend and critic who saved the poet from censurable mistakes. Aneau, however, is anything but friendly or supportive. He accuses Du Bellay of hypocrisy in proclaiming a "defense" of French poetry which is "plutôt offense et dénigration" 'rather an offence and disparagement.'[48] Instead of praising only five or six French poets in *Deffence* 2.1, Du Bellay ought to have praised "cinq douzaines d'autres" 'five dozen more' (207). And, instead of nominating Petrarch as a model for good usage, Du Bellay should have cited the work of *grands seigneurs,* great councillors, and judges in Parlement, "desquelles je voudrais mieux apprendre à parler, et écrire, et enrichir mon vulgaire, et ma langue illustrer" 'from whom I would better learn how to speak, write, enrich my vernacular, and make my language illustrious' (213). Petrarch himself derived models from Troubadour poets in southern France: "Tu nous fais grand déshonneur, de nous renvoyer à l'Italien, qui a pris la forme de la Poésie des Français" 'You do us a great dishonor to refer us to the Italian who took the form of his poetry from the French' (215).

Aneau endorses Horatian views about poetry and language, but in fact his assumptions support quite another set of practices and beliefs. Du Bellay associated such beliefs with a Ciceronism articulated and espoused by such sixteenth-century humanists as Pietro Bembo and Etienne Dolet and destined to constrict the development of Latin as well as vernacular style.[49] *Deffence* 2.12 represents Bembo as qualifying his own Latin Ciceronism by promoting the vernacular style of Petrarch and Boccaccio: "Je doute si onques homme immita plus curieusement Ciceron. . . . Toutesfois par ce qu'il a ecrit en Italien, tant en vers comme en prose, il a illustré & sa Langue & son nom" 'I doubt whether any more carefully imitated Cicero. . . . In any case for that he wrote in Italian both in verse and in prose, he did make both his language and his name illustrious' (190/104). Throughout the *Deffence* Ciceronism comes to represent a foil to a newly revitalized Horatian poetics.[50]

Both Cicero and Horace had sought to endow ancient Rome with a renewed cultural identity based upon but also antipathetic to the glories of Hellenic culture. Their question of how to use imported Greek models yielded two answers: either to translate them directly, and even rather slavishly, into Roman equivalents or else to transfer them through freer kinds of imitation and emulation. Cicero had advocated the first for galvanizing old values in the ancient republic, Horace the second in order to engineer new values for an emerging Augustan empire.[51] In 1540 Etienne Dolet had argued in his treatise

on *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (The technique of translating well from one language to another) that Cicero's theory of translation could contribute to the rhetorical training of a new kind of "Orateur Françoys" 'French Orator.'[52] In Du Bellay's treatise at the decade's end, the Ciceronian spokesman for republican rhetoric yields to the Horatian exponent of an imperialist poetics. The *Deffence* propounds a language not just for the nation but for an empire.

It seems significant that no such contest between Ciceronian rhetoric and Horatian poetics appears in Du Bellay's major source, Sperone Speroni's *Dialogo delle lingue* (1542). Its key interlocutor, Speroni's friend and mentor, Pietro Bembo, articulates a defense of the vernacular whose dialogic form introduces a fair amount of disagreement, contradiction, and inconsistency.[53] In an argument that actually inverts the historical Bembo's Ciceronism, Cicero and the other ancients come to figure the practice of a high but now outmoded style that can only inhibit growth and expansion: "Onde quanto parlate e scrivete latino, non è altro che Cicerone trasposto più tosto da carta a carta, che da materia a materia" 'Whenever you would speak or write Latin in his style, it would be nothing more than Cicero transposed from one page to another, not from one field of ideas to another' (100/185). The terror of sameness, an aversion to homotextual promiscuity, a fear of *différance* without difference, argues against the Ciceronian program of translation into the vernacular. At the same time Speroni's dialogue makes no counterreference to Horace or his alternative precept.

The latter nonetheless appears in Du Bellay's *Deffence,* in which the ideal of a freer, more flexible kind of imitation serves the national goal of cultural legitimization in France. The imitator shapes, molds, adapts, and reworks the model to a new order, until the product bears the imitator's stamp and an impress of the age. Horace's career cannily exemplifies this outcome.[54] A pragmatist who rose to the equestrian rank in Brutus' army, Horace accommodated himself to the realities of an emerging empire after his commander's defeat at Philippi. A writer in the neoteric mold, comfortable with aesthetic detachment and averse to the acclaim of the masses, he seemed to belie those values by entering the public arena as an official poet, protégé of Maecenas, and shaper of Augustan policy. But for all of his technical mastery of lyric meters Horace regarded his odes and epodes as inferior to Virgil's hexameter epic, a genre held in highest esteem for its lofty ambitions: "Neque haec dicere nec gravem . . . / conamur" 'I am not strong enough to try such epic flights' (*Odes*

1.6.5–9). The specter of not rising to imperial epic could only haunt him as it would haunt Du Bellay.

To Du Bellay, Horace becomes an emblem for the poet's successful accommodation with history as well as a totem for ancient classical ideals. The sonnet sequence *Olive* and the *Vers lyriques* that accompany the *Deffence* both begin and end with a line from Horace, "Caelo musa beat" 'The muse confers blessings in heaven' (*Odes* 4.8.29).[55] Recommendations to the aspiring poet which Horace had made conventional in his *ars poetica* inform Du Bellay's recommendations in *Deffence* 2.4. They urge the "Poëte futur" to respect epic as the noblest poetic form and to respect the ode as the noblest lyric form, "à l'example d'Horace" 'after the example of Horace,' but they include the sonnet as well, "conforme de nom à l'ode, & differente d'elle seulement pource que le sonnet a certains vers reiglez & limitez" 'conformable in name with the ode, and different from it only in that the sonnet has a certain number of lines, limited and regulated' (121/73).

In both theory and practice, however, such sonnets represent a compromise. The preface to the second edition of *Olive* recounts that in 1546 Jacques Peletier du Mans, who a year later would publish his own French translation of twelve of Petrarch's sonnets, urged Du Bellay to cultivate the sonnet and ode as forms suitable for his purposes, "encores pue usitez entre les nostres" 'still little used among our poets.'[56] As it happens, this choice reflects a second-best option, the first being epic. Diffident about his talent, Du Bellay imagines that he can succeed only if he sets a modest goal, "si non entre les premiers, pour le moins entre les seconds" 'if not among the first rank of poets, then at least among the second' (44). Since Peletier himself viewed epic as the highest genre in his both his verse translation of Horace's *ars poetica* (1541) and in his prose treatise *Art poétique* (1555), we can only surmise that, by steering Du Bellay toward lyric, Peletier might have doubted or disparaged his friend's capacity for epic.[57]

Like Horace, Du Bellay would compensate for his deficiency by theorizing about history and the historical process and by experimenting with lyric forms. In the former regard an implied contrast between Cicero as spokesman for the Roman Republic and Horace as spokesman for the Roman Empire subtends the *Deffence*. The idea, if not the actual institution, of Cicero's republic appears as a necessary stage before the advent of Horace's empire in this historical dialectic. The local and regional composition of a republic allows the polity to consolidate a language and a culture bequeathed as its past inheri-

tance. The transcendent scale of empire enables it to spread its language and its culture while taking from its dependencies as much as it gives. Cultural enrichment through translation as proposed in the Ciceronian agenda constitutes an initial stage to be amplified through the work of imitation and of empire in the Horatian agenda. At this point the Ciceronian precept yields to its Horatian counterpart.

The outcome of this process is by no means predetermined, nor is Horace's supremacy assured. Du Bellay begins a restrained discussion of the *translatio studii* from ancient Rome to modern France with a metaphrase of Horace's "ore rotundo loqui" 'to speak with a rounded mouth' (*Epistles* 2.3, his *ars poetica,* lines 323–24).[58] He then complicates this reference first by suppressing Horace's name in the formula "comme dict quelqu'un" 'as someone said' and then by pointing to the failure of recent poets to follow Horace's advice, "non immitans la curieuse diligence des Grecz, aux quelz la Muse avoit donné la bouche ronde (comme dict quelqu'un) . . . comme depuis aux Romains immitateurs des Grecz" 'not imitating the curious diligence of the Greeks to whom the muse had given a rounded mouth (as some one said) . . . as afterwards she gave to the Romans imitating the Greeks' (1.9: 49/41). It is as though two *translationes studii* have intervened, a successful one in chronological time which passed from Greece to Rome when Horace imperialized Greek models for Roman use and an abortive one at some later interval when poets rejected Horatian precepts. The revival of Ciceronism, historically associated with republican autonomy and the civic humanism of northern Italian city-states, further delayed its movement.

From Du Bellay's perspective the outcome is ambiguous because cultural transmission is neither linear nor direct. It rather participates in a cycle of rise and fall, death and rebirth, a "loy inuiolable" 'inviolable law' which governs "toute chose crée" 'all created things' (1.9: 57/44). Like Lorenzo de' Medici in the *Comento,* Du Bellay asserts that the historicity of all languages undermines the supremacy of any single language. In Lorenzo's view the spread of the Roman Empire had made Latin a necessary vehicle for communication, just as current politics have allowed the Tuscan language to supplant Latin. For Du Bellay an erratic figuration complicates this view with elements of contingency and disturbing unpredictability. If cultural transmission were simply linear and direct, it would leave indelible marks as it advances toward new frontiers. It does not do so, however, because the past does not remain the past forever. Sooner or later it becomes present again, often without warning, and asserts its old claims, entering into competition with the cultural destinies of other

peoples, themselves subject to new alteration. Medicean Florence provides Valois France with a paradigm, just as it provides the Valois dynasty with a royal consort in the person of Henri II's wife, Catherine de' Medici. History confers upon France the ripened fruit of a Florentine patrimony as already by 1537 Florence had evolved from a republic into a principate with the Medici as hereditary rulers of a Tuscan territorial state. The result acknowledges Cicero's humanist contribution to an earlier Florentine Republicanism but now demonizes it for what it represents as antithetical to the values of a supraregional rule, the strengthening of a powerful monarchy and the rise of a French national state. The ritual and ceremonial forms of imperial self-representation already governing François I's and Henri II's public imagery find their complement in Du Bellay's version of Horace's imperial poetics.[59]

The public imagery of kingship in Du Bellay's France exalted the Valois monarch with his title *Rex Christianissimus*, but this title, traceable to the eighth century, could only prove troublesome in an age of religious factionalism ignited by Lutheran and Calvinist reform. What, after all, is "Most Christian"? In the last decade of François's reign the Cardinal de Chatillon, Mme d'Etampes, Jean du Tillet, Charles Du Moulin, and other grandee advisors had urged the king to affirm the effective power of royal patronage over the French Church by breaking from Rome.[60] This policy of Gallicanism refers to limitations ordained by the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1439), the Concordat of Bologna (1516), and the later Council of the Gallican Church (1551) upon papal jurisdiction over episcopal elections and dues on benefices in French territory. In questioning papal authority, François' and Henri's royalist advocates were rejecting the authority of a Rome-oriented culture in social and political as well as ecclesiastical affairs. The medieval church had assumed the ancient empire's role as custodian of culture, but it now seemed right for the French monarchy to take over that role.

In this charged environment potent allusions to Horace inflect Du Bellay's dedication of the *Deffence* to his cousin, Cardinal Jean du Bellay (1492–1560).[61] Advisor to both François I and Henri II and rival to the papal ally Cardinal de Tournon, Jean du Bellay pursued a policy of enlightened reform within the Gallican Church and irenic compromise with Rome. Joachim Du Bellay acknowledges the importance of this policy when he paraphrases Horace's scruples in *Odes* 2.1.114 about poetry that distracts public officials from their duties to the state: "Pecheroy-ie (comme dit le Pindare latin) contre le bien publicque, si par longues paroles j'empeschoy le tens que tu donnes au service de ton Prince" 'Shall I not sin (as says the Latin Pindar) against the

public good if by long speech I interrupt the time thou dost give to the service of thy prince.' Far from diverting the cardinal, the *Deffence* will help him to advance the cause of French nationalism, "au profit de la Patrie" 'to the profit of the country' (4/17). Du Bellay conveys his excitement in a theatrical metaphor that inscribes the plot of his cousin's drama across all Europe and even beyond, "veu le personnaige que tu joues au spectacle de toute l'Europe, voyre de tout le monde, en ce grand Theatre Romain" 'seeing the character that you play in the spectacle of all Europe, nay of the whole world in this great Roman theatre' (3/17). With an echo of Horace's *Odes* 1.3 which compares Virgil's task as an epic poet to a Herculean labor, "perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor" 'so did Herculean labor burst hell's gates' (1.3.36), Du Bellay compares the cardinal to the Gallic Hercules, mythic ancestor of the French king, bearing France's affairs upon his robust shoulders, "non moins que le Ciel de celles du grand Hercule" 'none less than was heaven upon those of Hercules' (5/17).[62]

This dedicatory figure presages a more elaborate reference to Hercules at the end of the *Deffence.* There Hercules appears as a golden-tongued orator "tirant les peuples apres luy par leurs oreilles, avecques une chesne attachée à sa langue" 'who drew the nations after him by their ears with a chain attached to his tongue' (197/107). Again an echo from Horace lends weight to this final sentence. The line that Du Bellay uses as a tag for the beginning of *Olive* and end of his *Vers lyriques,* "Caelo musa beat" 'The muse confers blessings in heaven,' proceeds in Horace's text to evoke Hercules as a recipient of these blessings: "Sic Iovis interest / optatis epulis impiger Hercules" 'So tireless Hercules sits among Jove's favorite banqueters' (*Odes* 4.8.29–30). The *Vers lyriques* abridges this quotation, but the *Deffence* compensates by introducing the figure of a transmogrified Hercules leading the French people onward with his persuasive eloquence. The difference between Horace's Hercules and Du Bellay's is that the former basks in a sybaritic immortality, while the latter forges onward with the work of nation building.

Du Bellay's direct source for this figure is a set of parallel passages from works by François I's premier humanist, Guillaume Budé, the first from his erudite Latin *Commentary on Justinian's Digest* (1508) (11.3.1.3), the second from his French treatise *L'institution du prince,* written for François I in 1519 but not published until 1547.[63] In these passages Budé draws from Lucian's ironic oration *Prolalia Herakles* (Heracles: An Introduction) a striking account of how the giant Ogmios, a Celtic prototype for the Greek Hercules, "drags after him a great crowd of men who are all tethered by the ears!"[64] Budé associ-

ates the tethers of this Gallic Hercules with rhetorical skills, his ability to persuade others through words rather than compel them by force.[65] Attacking members of the Valois court who are "ignorant of erudition," Budé calls for a commitment to Hercules's oratorical skills encoded in the precepts of ancient eloquence and available through humanistic study. Only "those who are not tickled by any harmonic sound" will fail to find merit there.[66]

As a precursor of Du Bellay's *Deffence,* Budé's program turns persuasive eloquence into a vehicle of governance for the ruling elite. To this view Du Bellay adds that the study of eloquence is not just a province of republican humanism but that it can become a domain of the courtly aristocracy and lesser nobility to which he belongs. The ideal of eloquence personified by Budé's humanism in François's just-ended reign now gives way to a national ideal articulated in the *Deffence* at the beginning of Henri II's reign. From it is expunged all reference to Ciceronian republicanism as Du Bellay shifts his constituency from scholars and professional men of letters to a newly Paris-based courtly elite. Poets with an aristocratic pedigree such as Du Bellay can offer valuable service to the king and state as educated and refined spokesmen for the latter, as useful participants in the social division of labor rather than as aloof, free-floating, disinterested noblemen or upwardly striving bourgeoisie. When such poets process and absorb the best from ancient and other modern cultures, they enrich the stock of their emergent nation in powerful and productive ways. Among the forms that they can use for this purpose is a Petrarchism imported from Italy.

5 *Totems for Defense*

Du Bellay and Marot

The author of the ironically named *Quintil Horatien* was right to think Du Bellay's revisionary *ars poetica* a challenge to Cicero's republican ideology and cultural style. Adopting the imperial ideology and neoteric style of Horace, Du Bellay's vernacular program called for the importation into France of a manifestly Italianate Petrarchism that could supplant the models of an indigenous French literature. These models include such totemic figures of French poetry as the authors of the *Roman de la rose,* Guillaume de Machaut, Alain Chartier, and François Villon, whom Aneau himself had mentioned with admiration, as well as such contemporaries as Clément Marot, Jean Lemaire de Belges, and Mellin de Saint-Gelais. The result would be nothing less than a struggle for supremacy in the French canon and a potential setback to developing a national culture.

The situation illustrates the social psychology sketched by Freud in *Totem and Taboo.* According to his argument, the totem functions as a keeper and defender of the tribal horde. It projects upon the clan a bond of common ancestry, foretelling its future and guiding its action. In return for this real or imagined service, the clan's strongest members unite to protect the totem. They do so, however, not because of any filial reverence or altruistic motivation toward it. Instead, they are compensating for an act of violence which they earlier incurred upon the totem. In fact, their original goal was to overcome the tyranny of a father whom the totem represents. Vanquished, the totem exerts over the clan even more power than before when its members expiate their guilt in having opposed it.

In this light Du Bellay's *Deffence* records hostile impulses toward an earlier French literary discourse as well as emotional ambivalences that derive from such hostility. It directs its criticism against poetry by writers who originated in the non-noble classes and who rose to great prominence under monarchs whom they served. Although recognizing their national contribution as a cultural standard and norm, indeed as a model and paradigm for modern practice, the *Deffence* reveals a deeply conflicted relationship to this standard and norm. In the name of cultural continuity it speaks against perpetuating inbred native forms, promoting instead an exogamic conquest of such literary genres from abroad as the Italian sonnet and canzone.

This incorporation of the foreign bears further analogies with Freud's narrative. In the shadow of the totem, members of the clan avert fratricidal competition for mates by seeking wives from outside the community. As members of the clan reestablish fraternal bonds with one another, they honor the memory of the ancestral father figure whose dominance they once resented. The practice of exogamy becomes a conscious law: no inbreeding among communal members, no incest among blood relatives. Far from relating to any natural or inherent impulse, the taboo effects a social and psychological resolution of generational rivalries among men. It henceforth represents a final covenant with the dead father who, in Freud's words, becomes "stronger than the living one had been" (13.143).

Du Bellay's program for literary renewal in the *Deffence* proposes a similar law against cultural incest and a similar covenant with the resources of an older French poetry. To fertilize French literary discourse, to aggrandize its literary possibilities, and to illuminate its many achievements (as in the sixteenth-century meaning of *illustration* [making illustrious]), Du Bellay calls for a program of exchange with heterogeneous foreign cultures and heterotextual foreign literatures. This program is manifestly exogamic as Du Bellay advises young poets to pollinate French literary discourse with models from ancient Greece and Rome and from Italy since the time of Petrarch onward. To renew literary history in this way might cast older French forms into obscurity, but it may also encourage their preservation as sacred inheritances from the past and as emblems of national identity for the present. No incest, no inbreeding, can be allowed to deepen actual or potential, real or imagined rivalries among competing cultural centers of sixteenth-century France, whether in the royal courts at Paris, Fontainebleau, or the Loire; the courts of the provincial feudal nobility in Brittany, Flanders, Burgundy, or Savoy; urban confraternities at Amiens, Lille, or Rouen; and middle-class cenacles at cities such as

Poitiers and Lyon.[1] One result is to fantasize a bond that French culture might otherwise not possess, a factitious sense of national identity rooted in a common past. A literary heritage can so function when its inheritors preserve it as inviolable. For their current literary production these same heirs may turn to foreign forms instead of duplicating native models to exhaustion. Thus in *Deffence* 1.8 Du Bellay finds it "point chose vicieuse, mais grandement louable, emprunter d'une Langue etrangere les sentences & les motz, & les approprier à la sienne" 'no vicious thing, but praiseworthy, to borrow from a foreign tongue thoughts and words and appropriate them to one's own,' just as he finds it dubious to applaud those "qui s'estiment estre des meilleurs, quand plus ilz ressemblent un Heroet, ou un Marot" 'who believe themselves to be the better when they most resemble an Antoine Héroët or a Clément Marot' (46–47/40).

To consolidate past gains and stimulate future production, Du Bellay totemizes the literary heroes of an earlier age, although some choices for inclusion in a new national canon might seem odd. He had pressing reasons to modernize the canon. When François died in March 1547, Henri II undertook vengeful recriminations against persons and policies favored by the father whom he hated. By 1549 such older court poets as Hugues Salel, Jean Lemaire de Belges, Antoine Héroët, and even the followers of Clément Marot appear to have fallen into disfavor as casualties of changing tastes.[2] In this sense the importation of Petrarchan poetry from Italy helped to displace rivalries among younger French poets who would compete for the recently installed king's attention. It could resolve them only in part, however, since Petrarch's model should necessarily inspire these same poets to compete in new forms. It required them to depart from their French forebears, including those who had introduced Petrarch's poetry into court circles before 1549. They encompass Clément Marot, Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and Maurice Scève but also Rhétoriqueur poets such as Jean Robertet and Jean Molinet, who had glanced at least sideways at Petrarch's achievement. In the *Deffence* these poets acquire totemic status as forerunners who deserve recognition and admiration but not direct imitation.

What made Petrarch especially worthy of emulation in Du Bellay's eyes? As the *Rime sparse* entered into print with commentaries celebrating the polish of its language, its social and cultural refinement, its political vision, and its moral amplitude, Petrarch emerged as an exemplar of virtues associated with the new courtly administration. An example is Du Bellay's sonnet 93 in *Olive,* an adaptation of Petrarch's sonnet 229 which reflects concerns articulated by the commentators:

Ores je chante, et ores je lamente,
Si l'un me plaist, l'autre me plaist aussi,
Qui ne m'areste à l'effect du souci,
Mais à l'object de ce qui me tormente.
Soit bien ou mal, desespoir ou attente,
Soit que je brusle ou que je soy' transi,
Ce m'est plaisir de demeurer ainsi:
Egalement de tout je me contente.

Madame donc, Amour, ma destinée,
Ne changent point de rigeur obstinée,
Ou hault, ou bas la Fortune me pousse.
Soit que je vive, ou bien soit que je meure,
Le plus heureux des hommes je demeure,
Tant mon amer a la racine doulce.

Now I sing, now I complain; if one pleases me, the other pleases me too, me who does not dwell on the effect of my care but on the object of what torments me. Whether good or ill, despair or hope, whether I burn or am frozen, it is a pleasure to remain in such a state, I am equally content with both.

Hence let my lady, Love, my destiny yield not a bit of their stubborn severity, whether Fortune propels me high or low. Whether I live or even whether I die, I remain the happiest of men, as long as my bitter plant has so sweet a root.

Here is Petrarch's original:

Cantai, or piango, et non men di dolcezza
del pianger prendo che del canto presi,
ch' a la cagion, non a l'effetto, intesi
son i miei sensi vaghi pur d'altezza.
Indi et mansuetudine et durezza
et atti feri, et humili et cortesi,
porto egualmente, né me gravan pesi,
né l'arme mie punta di sdegni spezza.

Tengan dunque ver' me l'usato stile
Amor, Madonna, il mondo et mia fortuna,
ch' i' non penso esser mai se non felice.
Viva o mora o languisca, un più gentile
stato del mio non è sotto la luna,
sì dolce è del mio amaro la radice.

> I sang, now I weep, and I take no less sweetness from weeping than I took from singing, for my senses, still in love with heights, are intent on the cause, not its effects. Thence I bear equally mildness and harshness, cruel gestures and humble and courteous; nor do any weights weigh me down, nor does any point of disdain shatter my armor.
>
> Let them keep toward me their accustomed style, Love, my lady, the world, and my fortune; I think I shall never be anything but happy. Whether I live or die or languish, there is no nobler state than mine under the moon, so sweet is the root of the bitter.

Among the commentators Antonio da Tempo, Vellutello, and Gesualdo interpret, the speaker's military figures as metaphors. Antonio relates the speaker's *arme* to his *rime* as a defense against Laura's power over him. The lover would subdue her with his poetry: "Larme sue eran e suo rimar & poetizare laudando la sua donna" 'His arms were his rhyming and his poetic composition in praise of his lady' (G5^{v}). Vellutello repeats this conjecture and adds that Petrarch deploys humility in order to counter Laura's disdain, as in sonnet 179, in which he averts her Medusa-like gaze with eyes "pien d'umiltà sì vera / ch'a forza ogni suo sdegno indietro tira" 'full of such true humility that she necessarily draws back all her anger' (109^{r}). Gesualdo iterates the social value of Petrarch's behavior: "Le arme del Poe. Erano defensiue, ne altro che grande humilitade" 'The poet's arms were his defenses, nothing other than his great humility' (CCLXXX^{v}). One result is to tame the aggression lurking in Petrarch's amatory complaint. Du Bellay furthers this pacification when his speaker tames himself: "Egalement de tout je me contente."

Du Bellay's emphasis finds precedents in other commentaries. Petrarch cites the attack on him by "Amor, Madonna, il mondo et la mia fortuna." Against them he wields the *stile* (sylus, pen, style) of his poetry. Antonio Brucioli explicitly associates this style with a moral outlook by linking it to a "modo di fare" 'a way of acting' (154^{v}). Fausto da Longiano praises the poet for ennobling Laura, the cause of his suffering, "la causa dicendo philosophi essere piu nobile de suo causato" 'philosophers saying that the cause is more noble than the effect' (85^{v}). Daniello comments that Petrarch is influenced no less by the good that Laura does than by the harm: "Il poe era molto travagliato, hora da le buone care che ML gli facea, e hora di le cattive" 'The poet was very vexed, now by the good welcome that Laura gives him, now by the ill' (122^{v}). Castelvetro notes that Petrarch has transformed his optimistic outlook into a source of strength: "Ha una corazza indosso di felicita" 'He reveals a gallantry induced by felicity' (394).

In the wake of such commentaries Du Bellay directs his attention to *l'object* of his lament, Olive, displaying the nobility of character which Fausto attributes to Petrarch. With equanimity ("Egalement de tout je me contente"), the speaker inflects the verb "ne changent point" as either an indicative statement of fact, "they yield not a bit," or a subjunctive of wish or command, "let them not yield a bit," the latter an assertion of self-confidence in the face of opposition.[3] Either way he expresses his independence. The figuration of Olive as a tree sacred to Minerva, in direct response to Petrarch's figuration of Laura as a protective plant sacred to Apollo, brings Du Bellay to conclude with a tribute to "la racine doulce." The speaker's relationship with Olive provides an opportunity for emotional growth, intellectual development, and social maturation.

For French precursors the *Deffence* cites a vast body of courtly poetry with amatory themes, much of it no less accomplished than Petrarch's. As Du Bellay pushes into the past to establish a pedigree for his own style, he selects two poets as forerunners, conjoining them with a double use of *quasi* into the figure of a single author. They are the poets of the *Roman de la rose,* and their lineage has literary, linguistic, social, and cultural value:

> De tous les anciens poëtes Francoys, quasi un seul, Guillaume du Lauris & Jan de Meun, sont dignes d'estre leuz, non tant pour ce qu'il y ait en eux beaucoup de choses qui se doyvent immiter des modernes, comme pour y voir quasi comme une premiere imaige de la Langue Francoyse, venerable pour son antiquité.
>
> Of all the ancient French poets one only, as it were, Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meung, are worthy to be read, not so much because there are in them many things which should be imitated by the moderns, as for seeing in them, as it were, a first image of the French language, venerable for its antiquity. (2.2: 92/63)

In canonizing both Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, Du Bellay responds to two distinctively different features of their corporate poem and its national literary authority.[4] Guillaume narrates an erotic allegory in a courtly style that fixes on a masculine desiring subject. Jean registers a series of "clerkly" arguments as a highly educated (and unremittingly masculinist) writer who criticizes if not Guillaume's courtly ideology, then at least its alleged Ovidian paradigm. Considered separately, each points toward a different development in French literary history. Guillaume represents a backward turn to coterie literature. Jean represents a forward turn to a professional bourgeois literature. Guillaume's sonority finds echoes in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century fixed-form lyrics of Guillaume de Machaut, Eustache Deschamps, and

Alain Chartier.[5] Jean's more extravagant *rhyme riche* finds successors among late-fifteenth-century "Grands Rhétoriqueurs," ultimately claiming a conflicted poetic authority for Du Bellay.[6]

The *Roman*'s textual history adds further layers of complexity to its national authority. So varied was its transmission with so many deletions and interpolations by still other poets and editors, especially in Guillaume's portion, that the result is truly a work of multiple authorship.[7] Well-known debates in the early fifteenth century already questioned the merits of Jean de Meun's contribution. Jean Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, attacked its immodest language and moral frivolity, while Christine de Pizan assailed Jean de Meun's masculinist prejudices in her poetic *L'Epistre au Dieu d'Amours* (1399) and in an exchange of letters with Gerson (1401–3).[8] The poet's defenders, usually professional middle-class civil servants such as Jean de Montreuil, provost of Lille and royal secretary, and Gontier Col, first secretary and notary to the king, supported his efforts to shape a national language and vernacular literature. Du Bellay joins the debate by praising Guillaume and Jean as though they were one poet, assigning equal value to their antithetical merits, so that Guillaume's stylistic elegance complements Jean's rhetorical bravado. The *imaige* of their old language draws Du Bellay's attention, and it is one to which Du Bellay relates by sharing the poets' ancestral origins in the Loire Valley, his downstream near Nantes, theirs upstream at its westward bend near Orléans. Guillaume came from a village in that vicinity, and so did Jean, although the latter had evidently studied in Paris. Like Du Bellay, both relinquished the dialect of their natal regions to the invented standard of a broadly homogeneous French vernacular.

Jean de Meun refers to this standard in a passage of the *Roman* in which he sketches the poem's broader purposes. There the God of Love, commissioning his barons to war against Jalousie to free Bel Acceuil, evaluates Guillaume's contribution by comparing it with poetry by Catullus, Gallus, Ovid, and Tibullus. As fifth in their line of succession, Guillaume has revived an amatory discourse unpracticed since antiquity. The God of Love vows to nurture Guillaume's successor until his maturity:

> Endoctrinez de ma sciance,
> si fleütera noz paroles
> par carrefors et par escoles
> selonc le langage de France,
> par tout le regne, en audiance.
> (10.607–14)[9]

> Indoctrinated with my learning, he will pipe our words in town squares and at the schools in the language of France, throughout the kingdom, for his listeners.

For Du Bellay this endeavor marks the patriotic apogee of an earlier culture. Jean's "langage de France," a compound of forms from the Loire Valley and the Paris basin, will transport Love's doctrine throughout the kingdom ("par tout le regne," which in the mid–thirteenth century encompassed not much more than the central region north of the Loire and a few areas south of it such as the recently incorporated Berry, Poitou, Saintonge, and Limousin) to all who would hear ("en audiance"), whether aristocrat, bourgeois, peasant, or academic, in assemblies both popular and learned ("par carrefors et par ecoles"). No more is literary language in the custody of provincial patronage, but it becomes the heteronomic coin of burgeoning commercial centers in northern France.

If the *langage de France* made the poem available to readers of many ranks and classes, it did so because Guillaume and Jean sacrificed their provincial Loire dialect to that of the royal court. This same language had nonetheless changed greatly in the three centuries between Jean de Meun and Joachim Du Bellay. By 1483 Jean Molinet (1435–1507) revised and moralized the poem in a prose version dedicated to Philippe de Clèves "pour mon tresdoubte prince qui desirez estre escolier en luniuersite damours qui est vng dur perilleux laborinth" 'for my dread prince who would be a student in the university of love, which is a hard and perilous labyrinth.'[10] In 1524 Clément Marot as secretary to the king's sister, Marguerite d'Angoulême (later Marguerite de Navarre), lent his prestige to a new edition, "corrige suffisantement / Et cotte bien a lauantaige / pour l'intelligence des lecteurs" 'sufficiently corrected and reorganized to its benefit, for the better comprehension of its readers.'[11] It was published in April 1526 by Galliot du Pré, a Parisian printer catering to a broad urban clientele.[12] Most of Marot's revisions entail minor changes in spelling or syntax which allow for a more balanced and precise metrical line.[13] Thus in the lines quoted here *sciance* becomes *science, carrefors* becomes *carrefours,* and *selonc* becomes *selon.* The most striking lexical change modernizes *si fleütera* to *il flajolera,* in which the verb loses its reflexive quality, while its substantive root *flajol* (pipe, flute), modern *flageolet,* replaces the older *flaüte* (from Latin *flatus* [breath, wind]).

The final line, however, poses a more intriguing revision:

> Endoctriné de ma science
> Il flajolera noz parolles

> Par carrefours et par escolles
> Selon le langaige de France
> Par tout royaulme en audience.
> (10.879–86)

The substitution of *royaulme* for *le regne* neither modernizes the diction, since *le regne* is as current as *royaulme,* nor does it change the meter, since the line retains its feminine caesura. The perceived advantage is semantic, as *royaulme* insists upon a general domain of governance, "par tout royaulme" 'through every realm.' In Jean de Meun's "par tout le regne," on the other hand, the particle functions in a restrictive sense ("throughout the kingdom"), limiting its geography to a mid-thirteenth-century area bordered by Anjou to the west, Bourbonnais to the south, and Paris and Picardy to the east and north. Marot's sixteenth-century revision implies that the *royaulme* has now spread beyond the limits of Jean's *regne,* a testimony to the power of monarchy and the efficacy of the French language in helping to expand it.[14]

Du Bellay enthusiastically ratifies this updating, not just because linguistic standards change and develop over time but also because political institutions change and develop too. Jean de Meun's small *regne* has long since given way to a vast *royaume,* a unified constellation of territories governed by the Crown. Marot's semantic revision has kept pace with the historical permutation. In reclaiming the literary status of the courtly Guillaume and the clerkly Jean, just as that of the streetwise François Villon, whose poetry he would later modernize, in September 1533, Marot drew from a reservoir of active memory and varied experience in advancing the idea of a French national literature and a canon of French national poets.[15]

As it happens, Marot formulated his canon of French poets in an epigram, "Des poetes françoys," which Du Bellay cites for naming those "assez congneuz par leurs oeuvres" 'well enough known by their works' (2.2: 93/63). Marot wrote his poem, modeled closely on Martial's "Ad Litianum" (*Epigrams* 1.29) as a commendatory verse for an edition of Hugues Salel's *Oeuvres* published at Paris by Pierre Roffet in February 1540.[16] It was a canon that evidently impressed Jacques Peletier du Mans, for when he translated Horace's *ars poetica* into French verse in 1544, he substituted for the names of Latin poets in the original those of the French poets endorsed in Marot's poem.[17] Fittingly, Marot endorses poets who, like Salel, had risen from the middle classes or lower gentry to acquire patronage from the royal house and upper nobility through their canny celebration of French national destiny.[18] And, fittingly too, he associates each with a distinct region of what would become modern France:

De Jan de Meun s'enfle le cours de Loire.
En Maistre Alain, Normandie prend gloire
Et plainct encor' mon arbre paternel.
Octovian rend Cognac eternel.
De Moulinet, de Jan le Maire & Georges,
Ceulx de Haynault chantent à peines gorges.
Villon, Cretin, ont Paris decoré
Les deux Grebans ont Le Mans honnoré
Nantes la Brette, en Meschinot se baigne.
De Coquillart s'esjouyt la Champaigne:
Quercy, Salel, de toy se vantera,
Et (comme croy) de moy ne se taira.

With Jean de Meun the course of the Loire swells with pride; in Master Alain Chartier Normandy takes glory, and it still weeps for my paternal tree; Octovian de Saint Gelais makes Cognac eternal; about Jean Molinet, Jean Lemaire de Belges, and Georges Chastellain, people in Hainault sing with full throats; François Villon and Guillaume Cretin have decorated Paris; the two Grebans, Arnoul and Simon, have honored le Mans; Breton Nantes bathes in the glory of Jean Meschinot; for Guillaume Coquillart, Champagne rejoices; Quercy, O Hughes Salel, will boast about you, and, as I'd like to think, won't be silent about me.

Apart from Jean de Meun and François Villon, whose work Marot had revised, Hugues Salel (1503–55?), the poem's addressee, claimed a special purchase on Marot's imagination. As a translator of books 1 to 10 of Homer's *Iliad* and as a writer of classical epigrams, epitaphs, an *eclogue marine,* and various dizains, he exemplified a new humanism with its emphasis on philological expertise, a deeper knowledge of antiquity, and the recovery of ancient classics.[19] As a native of Marot's Quercy, Salel rose through the ranks from gentry origins as secretary to the president of the Toulouse Parlement who belonged to François I's private council. Catching the attention of the king who appointed him royal *valet de chambre* and *maître d'hôtel*, Salel blazed a path that Marot and Du Bellay would celebrate.

Most of the others on Marot's list—including his father, Jean Marot, alluded to as "mon arbre paternel"—took some inspiration from Alain Chartier (ca. 1390–1435), a commoner from Normandy who parleyed his rhetorical skills into becoming secretary for King Charles VII.[20] These poets, designated in modern literary histories as Grands Rhétoriqueurs, share a penchant for intricate rhyme, elaborate internal assonance and consonance, ingenious plays on words and figures of speech, and striking formal and metrical variation.[21]

With the exception of Meschinot and Octovien de Saint-Gelais, who were born into the aristocracy, each rose from the conditions of a protobourgeois middle-class birth to higher rank and esteemed recognition, and each built upon the work of his forerunners.[22] Above all, by serving the French monarch and his dynastic interests at crucial junctures of history, each exercised considerable moralist, propagandist, and historiographical talent on behalf of the Crown.[23]

Du Bellay could only be struck by the coincidence of these poets' lower-class origins, pedagogical development, and services rendered to the Crown in times of national formation and political consolidation.[24] Each had earned prestige and reward by subordinating his regional interests to the corporate destiny of a unified France.[25] Their collectively earned merit and spectacular rise from humble beginnings to positions of considerable importance reinforced the lesson that all of them had achieved success through a systematic training in the rhetorical arts.[26] Finally, for most of these poets the Italianate culture of Petrarch and Petrarchism loomed large in their literary imagination. Petrarch's reputation had set a standard for French poets to acknowledge if not as a specific model for a particular style, at least as an icon of Italian culture which Gallic culture must confront. The unmistakably patriotic tenor of their verbal competence, expressive ingenuity, and stylistic virtuosity proved useful to the Crown and beneficial to themselves.

Clément Marot carried their program further by urging an enthusiastic, though not exactly academic, pursuit of Latin and Italian models. His classical interests, his experimentation with Petrarchistic modes and his attraction to the Evangelical Scripture–based theology of Guillaume Briçonnet and Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples earned favor with Marguerite d'Angoulême.[27] In the *Epitaphe de Clément Marot* at the end of *Olive,* Du Bellay associates the grandeur of these efforts with the geographical expanse of France:

> Si de celuy le tumbeau veux scavoir
> Qui de Maro avoit plus que le nom,
> Il te convient tous les lieux aller voir
> Ou France a mis le but de son renom.

> If you wish to find the tomb of him who bore more than the name of [Publius Vergilius] Maro, you should go see all the places where France has spread his renown.

The play on *Maro/Marot* in line 2 associates the poet with Publius Virgilius Maro as Marot himself had done in his 1526 opuscule *L'Enfer,* "Maro s'appelle

et Marot je me nomme: / Marot je suis, et Maro ne suis pas" 'He is called Maro and I am named Marot: Marot I am and Maro I am not' (ll. 362–63), motivating his detractor François Sagon to relate his name to *marotte* (foolscap) and *maraud* (rogue, knave) as well.[28] The paronymic pun implies that Marot has mastered and appropriated Virgil's gifts and that he has passed them on to French writers, who would otherwise lack them. This process of subsumption describes Du Bellay's echoing of Marot.[29] If Du Bellay were to have composed his poem upon Marot's death in September 1544, it might likely be his earliest surviving verse. Certainly its awkward rhyme (*renom*/ *nom, mort*/ *mord*) calls attention to the poet's search for an appropriate form, a search that brings him to repeat Marot's devise, "La mort n'y mord" 'Death has no sting,' in effect folding his own voice into that of his predecessor. To this final phrase Du Bellay juxtaposes Horace's "caelo musa beat" 'the muse confers happiness in heaven' at the close of the volume, creating a polyglot hybrid text with this Latin quotation (*Odes* 4.8.29).

Marot subsumed not only the Latin classics but also the work of his immediate predecessors, providing Du Bellay with an important conduit back to the Rhétoriqueurs. In such early poems as *Le Temple de Cupido* (1514), modeled partly on Jean Lemaire de Belges's *Les Epistres de l'amant verd* (1505) and *La Concorde des deux langages* (1511), Marot processed and absorbed the Rhétoriqueurs' elocutionary techniques while refining their style and tempering their ingenuity. His play on *Marot/Maro,* for example, complements his association of Lemaire's name with that of Homer, *Lemaire/l'Omer.*[30] His assimilation of their invention to classical topoi recalls Lemaire's humanist concerns. And even his interest in Petrarch evokes Lemaire's political imagination. The latter's *La Concorde des deux langages* had paid tribute to Louis XII's alliance with Florence and the Medici against the papacy and Venice by envisioning an accommodation between French and Tuscan cultural discourse to French advantage.[31] Composed at a time when Lemaire had lost favor at Marguerite of Austria's Burgundian court and was seeking patronage from Anne of Brittany and the French monarch, the first of two poems in Lemaire's five-part text situates the author in a narrative rescription of Petrarch's exile and amatory obsession.[32]

Here the poet introduces himself "cuydant suyvir par noble poësie / Le bon Petrarque, en amours le vray maistre" 'intending with noble poetry to follow the good Petrarch, the true master in matters of love' (5–6).[33] Just as Petrarch, "né de Florence" 'born in Florence,' fell in love with a foreign woman, "Veu qu'il esleut sa dame avignonnoise" 'since he chose his Avignonese lady,' so

Lemaire, "né de Haynnau" 'born in Hainault,' falls in love with a French woman from Lyon and naturalizes his affiliation: "Vins de bien loing querre amour lïonnoise" 'I came from afar to seek a Lyonnais love' (11–15). Petrarch came from Italy, Lemaire from Hainault, and France nourished them both. Filelfo, cited by Lemaire in his interlocutor's defense of Italian authors, had foregrounded Petrarch's ambivalent relationship to his Italian fatherland: "La more della patria hauer forza grandissima niuno e che non intenda. Et ancho il petrarca assai perho che essendo luy ribello & discacciato" 'There is no one who does not understand that love of one's fatherland is extremely potent; and especially Petrarch, since he was a rebel and an exile' (39^{v}). Lemaire borrows this characterization when he shifts his own allegiance from Burgundy to France and invents for himself a patriotic French connection to the "labeur historien" 'historical research' which he conducts in the Crown's name (*Concorde,* 42).

I used the verb *subsumed* to describe Marot's requisition of Latin classics and of Rhétoriqueur predecessors such as Lemaire, and I would repeat it to describe his capacious aesthetic. Marot enthusiastically adapted the Rhétoriqueurs' patriotic, epideictic, and occasionally satiric themes and motifs to the sensibilities of a new classical humanism, molding his materials in the form of elegies, epigrams, epistles, eclogues, and other ancient classical patterns.[34] Clarifying the Rhétoriqueurs' metrical forms, he also modulated the often self-promotional visual effects of their poetry.[35] Their large folio volumes, with double-columned pages laid out in heavy Gothic type with decorative rubrication often added by hand, accentuated the look and feel of their oral-aural wordplay and their material indebtedness to patrons who had sponsored their work.[36] The visual layouts of Marot's *Adolescence Clémentine* (August 1532) and *La Suite de l'Adolescence Clémentine* (January 1534) announce a departure. Both were printed at Paris by Pierre Roffet in neat octavos with a clear Roman typeface (emulating Italian editions of Petrarch and the ancient Latin classics). Setting the poems into distinct groups of metrically coordinated sequences, they announce the poet's presentational awareness of his poetry as a body of verse unmoored from its compositional situation to be circulated for a broad readership. The site of Petrarchism in France came subsequently to inhabit the sight of the printed line as it appeared in Marot's poetry, and Du Bellay would claim it for his own.[37]

The Rhétoriqueurs had stimulated Marot, not least through their occasional recall of Petrarch.[38] In 1476 Jean Robertet, secretary of three successive Bourbon dukes and afterwards of Louis XI and Charles VIII, adapted Petrarch into French in his drastically abridged *Les six triumphes de Petrarque,* com-

posed around 1476.[39] Other Rhétoriqueur poets used Petrarch's name as a metonym for amatory verse. In a satiric ballade bidding farewell to love, for example, Jean Molinet evokes Petrarch as an authority, "Car Amour hait gens vieulx comme ung aspic, / Ainsi que dit Maistre François Pétrac" 'For love hates old folk like a snake, as master Petrarch tells us.'[40] Marot himself asks, "Qu'est ce qu'Amour?" 'what is love?' in his "Epistre à son amy, en abhorrant folle amour" published at Rouen in 1541, and self-effacingly answers: "Voy qu'en dit Saingelays, / Petrarque aussi" 'See what Saint-Gelais says about it, and also Petrarch.'[41] In epigram 62 of the *Premier Livre des epigrams* published by Dolet in 1538 the haplessly smitten Marot reassures a certain Ysabeau that naming her in public will not damage her reputation, for "Petrarcque a bien sa maitresse nommée / Sans amoindrir sa bonne renommée" 'Petrarch has indeed named his mistress without diminishing her good name.'[42] In epigram 16, referring to Scève's discovery of Laura's tomb at Avignon in 1533, he obliquely affirms Laura's honor and virtue, "Car Françoys Roy sans cela n'eust prins soing / De t'honnorer de tumbe somptueuse" 'For without that, the King of France would not have taken the trouble to honor you with a lavish tomb.'[43] And in a series of rondeaux published in *Adolescence Clémentine* Marot echoes Petrarch's contrarieties, setting them in a playful style learned from the Rhétoriqueurs and the contemporary Italian Petrarchism of Cariteo, Serafino, and Tebaldeo, but also returning to specifically French lyric forms developed by Guillaume de Machaut, Eustache Deschamps, and Alain Chartier.[44]

In the last decade of his life Marot turned directly to Petrarch's *Rime sparse,* perhaps to ingratiate their admirer, François I. *La Suite de l'Adolescence Clémentine* includes a translation of canzone 323, "Le chant des visions," explicitly described as "traduit par le commandement du Roy" 'translated at the King's command.' The poet soon took refuge in Italy when François denounced the reformist movement after the Affair of the Placards in October 1534.[45] Upon his return to the French court in 1537 and eager to reclaim the king's attention, however, Marot translated six sonnets from the *Rime sparse* (sonnets 1, 161, 248, 338, 346, and 348), published in *opuscule* by Gilles Corrozet in 1539.[46] And at various times between 1536 and 1542 he tried his hand at four original sonnets in French, two of which were published in 1538 and 1542.[47]

Marot's rendering of Petrarch's sonnet 248, a poem that Du Bellay would adapt in sonnet 62 of *Olive* and sonnet 5 of *Les Antiquites de Rome,* shows his approach. Among many other poets throughout Europe, Scève in dizain 278 of *Délie,* Ronsard in sonnet 1 of *Les Amours,* Tyard in sonnet 2 of *Erreurs amoureuses,* and Philip Sidney in sonnet 71 of *Astrophil and Stella* would echo

this poem. In anticipation of my later discussions of these poems, I quote Petrarch's original in full:

> Chi vuol veder quantunque pò Natura
> e 'l Ciel tra noi, venga a mirar costei,
> ch' è sola un sol, non pur a li occchi mei,
> ma al mondo cieco, che vertù non cura;
> et venga tosto, perchè Morte fura
> prima i migliori et lascia star i rei:
> questa, aspettata al regno delli dèi,
> cosa bella mortal passa et non dura.
>
> Vedrà, s' arriva a tempo, ogni vertute,
> ogni bellezza, ogni real costume
> giunti in un corpo con mirabil' tempre;
> allor dirà che mie rime son mute,
> l'ingegno offeso dal soverchio lume;
> ma se più tarda, avrà da pianger sempre.

> Whoever wishes to see how much Nature and Heaven can do among us, let him come marvel at her, for she alone is a sun, not merely for my eyes, but for the blind world, which does not care for virtue; and let him come soon, for Death steals first the best and leaves the wicked: awaited in the kingdom of the blessed, this beautiful mortal thing passes and does not endure.
>
> He will see, if he comes in time, every virtue, every beauty, every regal habit, joined together in one body with every marvelous tempering; then he will say that my rhymes are mute, my wit overcome by the excess of light. But if he delays too long he shall have reason to weep forever.

Marot's version pointedly reduces Petrarch's sense of wonder and miracle to a matter of earthbound beauty. Its opening lines, for example, omit Petrarch's reference to *ciel* (heaven) and represent Laura as a product of what nature alone can do:

> Qui vouldra veoir tout ce que peult Nature,
> Contempler vienne une qui en tous lieux
> Est ung soleil, ung soleil à mes yeulx,
> Voyre aux ruraulx qui de vertu n'ont cure.

> Whoever wishes to see all that Nature can do, let him come study one who in all places is a sun, a sun for my eyes, and indeed for the rustics who do not care for virtue.

The vague indeterminacy of Petrarch's *quantunque* (how much) gives way to the definite *tout* (all). In deviating from Petrarch's Italian text, Marot's sense of poetry as a material craft demystifies the imaginative process that the original evokes. In line 2, for example, Marot's *contempler* (look at attentively, study carefully), attenuates the emotive wonder of Petrarch's *mirar* (marvel at). Whereas Petrarch affirms an abstract moral judgment in line 4 that the blind world, "mondo cieco," cannot appreciate Laura's virtue, Marot interjects his concrete social observation that a particular class of people, the "rureaulx," does not appreciate her excellence.

Throughout his translation Marot relates the beloved to worldly matters in other telling ways. The connecting rhyme in the first tercet, for example, links her *beauté* with aristocratic, and indeed royal manners, "moeurs de royaulté":

> S'il vient à temps, verra toute beauté,
> Toute vertu & meurs de royauté
> Joinctz en ung corps par merveilleux secret:

He will see, if he comes in time, every beauty, every virtue, and manners of royalty, joined together in one body by a marvelous discretion.

The secular thrust of both rhyme words (*beauté* and *royauté*) manages to displace the spiritualizing moral emphasis of Petrarch's rhyme words, *vertute* and *costume.* In the final line *merveilleux secret,* a term for rational discernment, or "marvelous discretion" (Latin *secretum,* the past participle of *secernere* [sift out], from *se* [aside] and *cernere* [separate, distinguish]), takes the place of Petrarch's *tempre,* a term for the artistry or subtle finesse by which a painter tempers light or shade with color or a musician tempers a note with contrasting sounds. Petrarch had represented Laura as an imaginative participant in the artistic process and as a pleasing result of what art can achieve. Marot represents her as part of the social world, a paragon of discriminating manners for both rustics and royalty.

Marot's earthbound Laura picks up a representation of the courtly beloved sketched in the commentaries. Both Squarzafico and Vellutello, for instance, regard Laura as an emblem of Petrarch's artistic concerns. Squarzafico associates this sonnet with the one that precedes it, whose speaker complains that his poetry falls short of Laura's excellence: "Lingua mortale al suo stato divino / giunger non pote" 'Mortal tongue cannot reach her divine state' (247.12). The commentator surmises that the poet composed sonnet 248 because "uedeua messer Francesco non hauere ditto ala sufficienza fece questo altro" 'Petrarch

seemed to think that he had not spoken sufficiently well about Laura' (K5[r]). Vellutello likewise foregrounds Petrarch's confession of his insufficient talent and his effort to compensate for it. The poet thinks that his readers "giudicheranno le rime fatte nelle sue lodi da lui, rispetto alla eccellentia di lei, esser mute e sorde, Et l'ingegno dal suo troppo lume e splendor offeso" 'would judge his rhymes about her to be deaf and dumb with respect to her excellence, and his imagination to be dazzled by her exceptional light and splendor.' Measured against Laura's perfection, the speaker's representation of her seems deficient, "perche a pieno et quanto bisognerebbe non n'ha saputo ne potuto dire" 'because he had neither insight nor skill to say fully what he should' (112[v]). Gesualdo directly paraphrases the sestet: Laura possesses "ogni uirtute, ogni BELLEZZA e dell'anima, del corpo, & ogni real COSTVME gentile, & angelico in un CORPO" 'every virtue and every beauty, both of soul and body, and every royal manner, both gentle and angelic, in her single body' (CCXCIIII[r]).

Marot's quick and greedy gravitation to a courtly Petrarchism may have been calculated to repair the king's poor estimate of his reform-minded interests. The years between the dedication of Calvin's Latin *Institutes* (1536) to François I and the rededication of his French *Institutes* (1541) to the king proved full of reversals and counter-reversals for the Evangelical movement embraced by the king's sister and Marot's early patron, Marguerite de Navarre.[48] Professing his loyalty to the Crown, Calvin nonetheless regarded the institution of monarchy as being "prone to tyranny" just as he disparaged "popular ascendancy" for its association with mob rule and sedition.[49] The optimum polity would be governed by a magistracy of the aristocracy and bourgeois elite because, "owing to the vices or defects of men, it is safer and more tolerable when several bear rule, that they may thus mutually assist, instruct, and admonish each other" (*Institutes* 4.20; 2.656–57).[50] As the extreme implications of Calvinist doctrine for antimonarchical sentiment threatened the institution of the monarchy itself, so courtiers earlier associated with Evangelical reform (such as Marot) needed to affirm their loyalty to the Crown. Translations of the *Rime sparse* afforded Marot an opportunity to sail ahead with the cut and jib of a devoted suppliant. Petrarch, after all, was a critic of the Avignon papacy in ways compatible with the Gallican idea of the church espoused since the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1439 and reasserted by François I. One need not be a Reformer to share this position. One has only to be a good Frenchman, as Marot might attest in his versions of Petrarch.

Three years after Marot's death, Henri's accession to the throne with his Italian wife, Catherine de' Medici, afforded other reasons for poets to display

their regard for the Tuscan Petrarch.[51] Amid patriotic displays of regional pride and national sentiment, two literary efforts at rendering the *Rime sparse* into French capitalized upon Petrarch's totemic status. One was by Peletier du Mans. Another was by Vasquin Philieul (1522–82). Both were published to honor not only Henri II but also his Florentine wife and the cultural heritage of northern Italy which she brought to France. In the words of Peletier's decasyllabic ode that closes his volume, "Congratulation sur le nouveau regne de Henri deuziesme de ce nom" 'Congratulation on the new reign of Henry II,' the translator foresees that France will experience a rebirth of national prestige: "Regner Henri, France renaistre a fait" 'With Henry ruling, France will indeed be born anew' (Lv^{r}).[52] The challenge of transporting Petrarch into the French language affirms the strength and vitality of that language and its readiness to achieve its own distinction.

Peletier's translation of twelve sonnets from the *Rime sparse* appears in his *Oeuvres poétiques* (privilege 1 September 1547), along with his partial renditions from Homer (bks. 1–2 of the *Odyssey*), Virgil (bk. 1 of the *Georgics*) Martial (one epigram), and Horace (three odes). In an original sonnet that precedes his translation of Petrarch, Peletier endorses a transparency that will enable the French language to display its stamina:

> QVI d'un Poëte / entend suiure la trace
> En traduisant, & proprement rimer,
> Ainsi qu'il faut la diction limer,
> Et du François garder la bonne grace.
> (Lvii^{r})

> Whoever undertakes to follow the trail of a poet and to rhyme gracefully while translating him, must file his diction and preserve the elegant grace of the French language.

Peletier's careful choice of twelve sonnets from the *Rime sparse* concurs. It presents the voice of a speaker whose affective contrarieties balance one another in a state of moral equilibrium. Avoiding the poems that Marot had translated, Peletier evinces a penchant for close pairings: sonnets 2, 71, 75, 132, 134, 163, 164, 267, 274, 276, 305, and 314, in the order of Bembo's Aldine edition. Here, for example, is his version of the first quatrain of sonnet 132:

> Que sens ie / en moy, s'amour ne suis sentant?
> Si c'est amour, quel peut il estre/, & quoy?
> Si bon, dou vient l'effet mortel de soy?
> Si non, dou vient que le mal m'en plaist tant?
> (Gviii^{r})

> What do I feel within myself if I am not feeling love? If it is love, what can it be, and why? If it is good, whence comes its deadly effect? If not, whence does it come that the evil pleases me so much?

Peletier's ideals of syntactic clarity, structural harmony, and semantic simplicity redeem Petrarchan style from the decadence that earlier Rhétoriqueurs associated with it, and they afford a vehicle to express noble thought and elevated sentiment. The commendatory huitain closing the volume says as much. Signed by "I. Dubellay, à la ville du Mans," it praises Peletier for his dignified style and his judicious selection of texts, "qui d'inuention / N'a pas acquis moindre perfection" 'who in matters of invention has acquired no less perfection' (Nvii^{v}). If Du Bellay's *Epitaphe de Clément Marot* might represent his earliest French verse, his huitain commending Peletier could mark his first appearance in print.

Displaying a quite different patriotic fervor, Vasquin Philieul, the canon of Notre Dame des Dons in Avignon, translator of Girolamo Vida's mock-epic *Scacchia ludus* (Game of chess), and author of a book of devotional exercises, prepared his translation to honor the city of Avignon, where the poet had spent most of his early adulthood.[53] Calling attention to this regional center, he links it to the royal family's role in transmitting Italian culture to France by entitling his volume *Lavre d'Avignon: av nom et aduev de la Royne Catharine de Medicis Royne de France/ Extrait dv poète florentin Françoys Pétrarque.* Philieul uses Vellutello's edition of Petrarch, with its biography of the poet and its descriptions of Avignon and the topography of Vaucluse. His rendition of 196 sonnets and 24 canzoni follows Vellutello's reordering, and it paraphrases Vellutello's commentary with "briefz sommaires ou Argumens requis pour plus facile intelligence du tout" 'brief summaries or arguments needed for an easier comprehension of the whole,' emphasizing passages that call attention to Avignon and its environs.[54] Published at the press of Iaques Gazeau in Paris that year, it was augmented in 1555 with a version of the *Trionfi* and the remaining poems from part 2 of Vellutello's edition.

For sonnets 56 and 148 (designated as sonnets 100 and 71, according to Vellutello's order) Philieul experiments with dodecasyllabic lines that celebrate the expansiveness of Petrarch's geographic imagination:

> Ne Pau, Tesin, ne Tymbre, Arnus, le Nil, Garonne,
> Tygris, Sonne, Inde, Hermus, Varus, Ganges, Rin, Seine
> Taue, Alphée, Danube, Hibere, Euphrates, Meine,
> Albe, Adige, Heber, Loyre, & Durennce, & le Rosne,

> Ne celle mer qu'il rompt, n'auroiêt uertu si bonne,
> Que hà ce gentil ruysseau contre mon feu & peine.
>
> Neither Po, Ticino, Tiber, Arno, Nile, Garonne, Tygris, Saône, Indus, Hermus, Var, Ganges, Rhine, Seine, Don, Alpheus, Danube, Ebro, Euphrates, Meine, Elbe, Adige, Hebrus, Loire, Durance, and Rhone, nor the sea that the last breaks against, would have power so effective against my fire and pain as this gentle stream.

In the headnote to the quoted verse Philieul writes that "il auoit plante vn petit laurier pres la Sorgue au nom de ma dame Laure" 'the poet had planted a small laurel near the Sorgue in the name of Mme Laura" (48r), iterating the preeminence of Avignon and Vaucluse in Petrarch's literary experience. And, to seal the Gallic identity of his cross-bred author, Philieul uses Clément Marot's sestet rhyme, repeating the latter's versions of sonnets 161 and 248 in place of new ones.

Philieul's dedicatory verse to Catherine de' Medici naturalizes Petrarch in commemorating "comment la France ha d'une en aultre mer / Toute l'Europe en brief temps & espace / Mise en sa main (dont sera l'oultrepasse / HENRY deuxieme) & les dons precieux / Qu'elle ha receus aultre fois des haultz cieulz" 'how from one sea to the other in a short span of time France put all Europe into her hands (a feat that Henry II will further exceed), along with precious gifts that she has earlier received from the heavens on high' (2r–4v). In this *translatio imperii* the nation proves worthy of its great inheritance: "Ie croy que n'est nation, qui dire ose, / I'excelle en biens: que France ne l'oppose" 'I believe that there is no nation that dares to say, "I excel in excellence," that France does not challenge' (2r). And a key component in this excellence is Petrarch's poetry, now fully French in Philieul's punning association of "Francesco" with *François* (Francis, French): "aussy Petrarque aura nouueau renom / Quand il sera François dessoubz ton nom" 'so Petrarch will acquire a new renown when he becomes Francis/French under [Catherine de' Medici's] name' (2v).

Two years into Henri's reign, Du Bellay enters upon this site of a naturalized Petrarchism. To Marot's, Peletier's, and Philieul's translations of Petrarch he brings Lemaire's sense of a connection between the French and Tuscan languages which reaches back to the origins of French literary greatness in the Middle Ages. Du Bellay views his cultural role as one of abetting the Franco-Italian alliance sought by Henri while tempering the dominance of the papacy over France in this arrangement.[55] Secular Petrarchism furnishes a poetic vehicle to express an incorporation of Italian values while managing a distance

from them as it recalls Petrarch's own Avignonese—and hence French—attachments as well as his critical distance from the Avignon papacy. In Lemaire's *La Concorde des deux langages* the austere Temple of Minerva surpasses in native worth the Petrarchan Temple of Venus, where "ont mis soubz banc les gens du roy Clovis, / Leurs viesles, leurs vieulx plectres et cordes" 'the descendants of King Clovis have put away their ancient plectrums and strings' (*Temple de Venus* 251–52). For Du Bellay the totems of French cultural history deserve equal respect as guarantors of national sentiment among the clan, having gradually acquired the reflective varnish of patriotic devotion.

6 *Illustrations of Taboo*

Du Bellay, Héroët, Saint-Gelais, Scève

Marot's varied achievements earned Du Bellay's respect, but so too did those of Antoine Héroët, Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and Maurice Scève. *Deffence* 2.2 designates them as models for a new national poetry yet not without ambivalence. This judgment is repeated in sonnet 62 of *Olive,* echoing Petrarch's sonnet 248 at the sequence's numeric midpoint.[1] Here is Du Bellay's poem:

Qui voudra voir le plus precieux arbre,
Que l'orient ou le midy avoüe,
Vienne, où mon fleuve en ses ondes se joüe:
Il y verra l'or, l'ivoire, et le marbre.

Il y verra les perles, le cinabre
Et le crystal: et dira que je loüe
Un digne object de Florence et Mantoüe,
De Smyrne encor', de Thebes et Calabre.

Encor' dira que la Touvre, et la Seine,
Avec' la Saone arriveroient à peine
A la moitié d'un si divin ouvrage:

Ne cetuy là qui naguere a faict lire
En lettres d'or gravé sur son rivage
Le vieil honneur de l'une at l'autre lire.

Whoever would like to see the most precious tree that the orient or the south might offer, come to where my river frolics in its waves; there he

> will see gold, ivory, marble. There he will see pearls, cinnabar, and crystal; and he will say that I praise an object worthy of Florence and Mantua, and moreover of Smyrna, Thebes, and Calabria. And he will say that the Touvre and the Seine together with the Saône would hardly happen upon half such a divine handiwork. Nor that one who has barely made us read in golden letters engraved upon its shore the old honor of the one and the other lyre.

By naming at the end of the octave the sites of Mantua, Smyrna, Thebes, and Calabria, the alleged birthplaces of Virgil, Homer, Pindar, and Horace as given in Petrarch's sonnet 247, to which is added Petrarch's Florence, Du Bellay implies a classical standard for vernacular poetry. By referring in the sestet to the rivers Seine, Touvre, and Saône, near the birthplaces of Héroët, Saint-Gelais, and Scève, he implies a canon of modern French authors which he professes to surpass. By echoing Marot's translated "Qui vouldra veoir tout ce que peut Nature," Du Bellay implies the latter's role in preparing for this canon. And by adding in the final lines yet one more unnamed poet—Pierre de Ronsard, a writer already famous for odes, as Du Bellay implies by alluding to Petrarch's sonnet 247, "l'una et l'altra lira" 'the one and the other lyre'—Du Bellay proclaims the emergence of a new professional into the arena. Three sorts of competition occupy his imagination: that of Petrarch against the classics; that of Du Bellay's French predecessors (Héroët, Saint-Gelais, Scève, and Marot) against one another; and that of Ronsard against Du Bellay.

Sonnet 62 is significant because it introduces a suite of clear, unmediated echoes from Petrarch into the sequence. *Olive* appeared in two separate editions, the first in April 1549 in tandem with the *Deffence* as a collection of fifty exemplary sonnets appended to the *Deffence* along with the *Anterotique* and fourteen *Vers lyriques,* the second on 3 October 1550 as a collection increased by sixty-five new sonnets and accompanied by the *Musagnoemachie* along with the *Anterotique* and *Vers lyriques.* Nine of the new sonnets appear interspersed among the original fifty sonnets. The first edition had displayed a variety of literary models.[2] A few of its poems echo Greek or Latin texts (sonnets 1, 16, 34 [32], 45 [41], 57 [49], and 59 [50], for example, recall the Anacreontics, Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, and Horace). Most refer to Italian models other than Petrarch. They include references to Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* (sonnets 25 [24], 28 [27], 29 [18], 31 [30], 35 [33], 37 [35], 39 [37], 42 [39], and 47 [42]), to Ariosto's lyric poetry (sonnets 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 30 [29], and 33 [31]), and to texts by Sansovino (sonnet 2), Castiglione (sonnet 9), Veronica Gambara (sonnet 12), Molza (sonnets 13 and 38 [36]), Gudiccioni (sonnet 17), Martinelli

(sonnet 19), Mozzarello (sonnet 20), Bentivoglio (sonnet 21), Navagero (sonnet 22), Battista della Torre (sonnet 24 [23]), Tomitano (sonnet 41 [38]), Coccio (sonnet 43 [40]), Camillo (sonnet 48 [43]), Castellani (sonnet 49 [44]), Capilupi (sonnet 52 [46]), Quirino (sonnet 54 [47]), Tansillo (sonnet 99), Della Casa (sonnet 100), Bembo (sonnet 109), and Daniello (as a creative poet in sonnet 113 rather than as a Petrarchan commentator). The texts from Sansovino through Quirino had all appeared in the first two of a series of eight octavo volumes of Petrarchan sonnets and canzoni published in northern Italy between 1545 and 1560, the penultimate of which is devoted to poetry by fifty-one women.[3]

Of Giolito's several anthologies, his first *Rime diverse* (1545) itself appeared in some measure as a patriotic, largely northern Italian response to the Treaty of Crépy.[4] This compendium of short poems by ninety-two writers from Tuscany, Lombardy, the Veneto, the Marche, Umbria, and Naples projects a wide range of social attitudes, political ideologies, religious convictions, and cultural assumptions, all registered in a homogeneous Petrarchan style. It accommodates the discordant perspectives of an old republican Florence and of the new ducal Tuscany, of patrician and republican Venice, of ducal city-states and papal dominions, and of Spanish-occupied territories. It expresses orthodox religious beliefs as well as heterodox reformist views that circulated throughout Italy before the Council of Trent. It includes classicizing motifs nourished by humanist learning but also popular, patriotic, and occasionally partisan motifs reflecting topical interests of the day. And it abounds in topographical figurations with praise of rivers and streams, mountains and plains, cities and palaces that register deep local sentiment.[5]

Giolito's anthology links these distinctly different perspectives to a willed belief in pan-Italian unity that thrives because of its diversity. Italian pride in the multiformity of Italy, in the cellular particularism of its principalities and municipalities, has become a principle that unites its varied peoples against domination by larger powers. The first volume opens with a dedication (written by Lodovico Domenichi on 8 November 1544) to Don Diego Hurtado di Mendoza, a commander of the imperial army at Pavia in 1525 and, since 1539, Charles V's ambassador at Venice.[6] Although it hails the Treaty of Crépy, concluded nine weeks earlier, as "una catena soauissima, laquale lega ogni arbitrio, & imprigiona ogni affettione" 'a most gentle chain that binds the will and constrains the emotions of each party' (Aiii^{v}), it also asserts a subtle noncompliance with Spanish hegemony. Nominally affirming that Hurtado has done well "ne i maneggi de i negotii importantissimi" 'in managing these most im-

portant negotiations' (Aiiii[r]), the dedication and the poems that follow display counter-evidence of a resistant Italian character and style, a proclamation of divergent interests and concerns, at the very least a prudent but proprietary validation of Italian cultural achievements in the face of foreign dominance.

Domenichi enjoins Hurtado to applaud the literary merit "di rime diuerse composte da i piu rari auttori della lingua nostra" 'of diverse poems composed by the most choice authors of our language' (Aiii[v]) and to celebrate these poets "per la diuersita de i concetti, et per la uarieta degli stili" 'for the diversity of their ideas and for the variety of their styles' (Aiiii[v]). This injunction might seem bizarre for an anthology dominated by normative Petrarchan figures, tropes, and elocutionary devices, but it in fact reveals a mingling of motives that sustain this poetry as the product of a single idiom, a recognizable Petrarchan discourse that unites its practitioners in a shared enterprise. The homogeneity of its style softens the individual, potentially subversive voice of patriotic sentiment without suppressing it, merging the idiosyncratic into the provisionally corporate.[7] Dominated by the Petrarchism of Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua,* as the anthology attests with a selection of seventeen poems by Bembo himself, this poetry offers a paradigm for all future efforts at Italian literary expression. And so too might it offer a paradigm for analogous efforts in French.

Du Bellay's appropriation of Giolito's Petrarchan authority in the first edition of *Olive* is therefore patriotic in two senses: it competes with Giolito's Italian models for attaining new standards of poetic excellence in France, and it adapts to a French perspective the patriotic themes and motifs celebrated by Giolito's Italian poets, who sing praises of their own local, regional territorial identities in the face of Spanish domination. Du Bellay's appropriation of Petrarch in the second edition of *Olive* adds yet another dimension through its direct borrowings from Petrarch. In addition to sonnet 62, sonnets 63, 66–70, 77, 79, 84, 85, 88, 89, 93, 94, 96, and 103 all recall exact models from the *Rime sparse.* It is as though Du Bellay were dispensing with intermediaries and returning directly to Petrarch, an act enabling him to sublimate his aggression against French competitors for poetic glory, allowing him to retain a tribal or familial identity with others of his profession.

In this context Du Bellay's sonnet 62 is especially significant because it positions several ancient and contemporary poets in relation to Petrarch, much the same as his *Deffence* 2.2 had done. There, without openly naming his French predecessors, the author reports that some critics have faulted Marot for being glib, Héroët for being too philosophical, Saint-Gelais for resisting publication, and Scève for courting obscurity:

> En l'un default ce qui est le commencement de bien ecrire, c'est le scavoir, & auroit augmenté sa gloire de la moitié, si de la moitié il eust diminué son livre. L'autre, outre sa ryme, qui n'est par tout bien riche, est tant denué de tous ces delices & ornementz poëtiques, qu'il merite plus le nom de phylosophe que de poëte. Un autre pour n'auoir encores rien mis en lumiere soubz son nom, ne merite qu'on luy donne le premier lieu. . . . Quelque autre voulant trop s'eloingner du vulgaire, est tumbé en obscurité aussi difficile à eclersir en ses ecriz aux plus scavans comme aux plus ignares. (2.2; 95–96)

> The one [Marot] is lacking in the beginning of good writing, which is knowledge, and would have increased his fame by half if by half he had diminished his book. The other [Héroët], besides his rhyme, which is by no means rich, is so denuded of all these delights and poetic ornaments that he merits rather the name of philosopher than of poet. Another [Saint-Gelais], since he has not yet brought to light anything under his own name, does not deserve to be awarded first place. . . . Such another [Scève], wishing to separate himself too far from the vulgar tongue, fell into an obscurity in his writings as difficult to elucidate for the most learned as for the most ignorant. (64–65)

Du Bellay contests these criticisms with a vague "ou trop iniques ou trop severes" 'either too unjust or too severe' (94/64), but he mounts no serious objection to them.[8]

The *Deffence,* of course, focuses upon the problem of fixing a French literary language as well as of formulating a national literary canon. The four poets summoned in this passage all cultivated an elite version of French spoken at court and prized in the great regional centers of France between the Loire and the Seine and especially in Paris and at Fontainebleau. Marot and Saint-Gelais attended directly upon the king. So did Héroët, who also served Marguerite de Navarre and spent long periods at Lyon with Scève and other Lyonnais intellectuals. Du Bellay associates their diverse use of "la Langue Francoyse," with the name of the king, "le roy Francoys," whom they served. Already in 1.3 he envisions a future when the linguistic roots sown during François's reign will spread throughout the kingdom, where the French language "s'elevera en telle hauteur & grosseur, qu'elle se poura egaler aux mesmes Grecz & Romains" 'will rise to such height and greatness, that it can equal the Greeks themselves and the Romans' (27–28/28). To effect such a goal, later poets must do more than passively reproduce the king's language, as in Barthélemy Aneau's claim that "bon et pur langage Français" resides solely "ès grandes cours" of the king, the nobility, and the Parlement (Goyet ed., 204–5). Du Bellay urges the poet

> de hanter quelquesfois, non seulement les scavans, mais aussi toutes sortes d'ouvriers & gens mecaniques, comme mariniers, fondeurs, peintres, engraveurs & autres, scavoir leurs inventions, les noms des matieres, des outilz, & les termes usitez en leurs ars & mestiers. (172)
>
> to haunt at times, not only the learned but also all kinds of workmen and mechanics, as mariners, founders, painters, engravers, and others, to know their inventions, the names of their materials, their tools and the terms used in their arts and crafts. (95)

The aim is not just to enrich a poetic style but also to bring it into congruence with the language spoken outside of court.

This proposal seems so striking because it describes more nearly what Marot achieved than Héroët, Saint-Gelais, Scève, or even Du Bellay himself.[9] The preface to the second edition of *Olive* extols the Valois court for nurturing the national vernacular, "seule escolle où voluntiers on apprent à bien proprement parler" 'the only school where one learns willingly to speak properly' (47). This is an extreme statement of what had become a commonplace opinion. Robert Estienne, for example, the compiler of a *Dictionaire françois-latin* (1540; successive editions in 1549, 1564, and 1573), identified the *langue d'oeil* in its purest form as the dialect of Paris spoken by the king and the elite at court, the Chancellery, the Treasury, and the Parisian Parlement.[10] Quite apart from facilitating these institutions of government, however, the Parisian dialect was a supraregional one that had assimilated a wide range of accents brought to the capital from other parts of France over several centuries. For political reasons the Île-de-France at the confluence of the Seine, Marne, and Oise Rivers was a natural site for the Capetian kings to concentrate their power. For economic reasons the fertile Parisian basin proved a prosperous site for trade and commerce. For strategic reasons Paris became the heart of a vast network of schools, law courts, and financial institutions that had grown there, evolving a language and a culture that fed—and fed upon—elite contributions from other regional centers throughout France.[11] Insofar as its dialect supplied the model for a written national language, it could either bring different groups of French people together or else remind them how different they might be from one another.[12]

My distinction between written and spoken French matters, since even before Du Bellay's time the written standard of Paris had come to prevail throughout the kingdom, while spoken forms everywhere retained local pronunciations attached to regional dialects or provincial patois. The often cited Ordonnance of Viller-Cotterets (1539) requiring the use of "la langue maternal

françois" in all civil and legal proceedings only codified what had been accepted practice throughout France for more than a century, reflecting the steady displacement of the written *langue d'oc* in the south by an administrative form of the *langue d'oeil* that few actually spoke even in the north.[13] Parisian humanists themselves disagreed about a serviceable orthography for this language as they promoted a series of reforms to bring spoken and written forms into greater congruence. In *Deffence* 2.7 Du Bellay complains that the barbarous orthography of the legal establishment, "depravée par les practiciens" 'depraved by the lawyers,' had become the accepted norm, even though it obscured the homophonic identities of many true rhymes "tant en voix qu'en ecriture" 'both in speech and writing' (148–49/84). For an improved system he refers to the work of the grammarian Louis Meigret, *Traité touchant le commun usage de l'Escriture Françoise* (Paris, 1542), which designed a phonetic spelling using diacritic signs and omitting all unpronounced letters.[14] Meigret had crafted it to replace haphazard practices traceable to thirteenth- to fifteenth-century scribal conventions that added unpronounced consonants based on Latin etymologies to improve legibility or distinguish among homophones.[15]

Meigret's system was doomed to fail for assuming as a standard the least standard component of language, its phonological element. Fourteenth- and fifteenth-century chroniclers actually expressed pride in the diversity of spoken French, since it attested to the size and greatness of the nation and to the capacity of its people to get along with one another.[16] They thought of these forms as sharing common roots in Gaulish, Frankish, and vulgar Latin which recalled their cultural homogeneity, while by comparison the languages of England and Germany seemed wretched patchworks of mixed forms that suggested a cultural disintegration.[17] Humanists of the sixteenth century added yet another reason for maintaining pride in the diversity of French: it evokes the dialects of ancient Greece. In *Champfleury* (1529) Geoffroy Tory compares the variety of "la langue de Court & Parrhisienne, de la langue Picarde, de la Lionnoise, & de la Prouensalle" 'the language of court and of Paris, of Picardy, of Lyon, and of Provence' to that of Greek: "Nostre langue est aussi facile a reigler et mettre en bon ordre, que fut iadis la langue Grecque, en la quelle y a cinq diuersites de langue, qui sont la langue Attique, la Dorique, la Aeolique, la Ionique, et la Comune" 'Our language is easy to regulate and put into order, as was Greek in which there are five dialects, namely Attic, Doric, Aeolic, Ionic, and the koine.'[18] Ronsard expressed a similar pride in his Vendômois idiom by referring to the ancient Greek poets' preferences for their own dialects.[19]

The *Deffence*'s commendation of Meigret's orthography suggests an effort to contain the spread of language by fixing the conventions of writing, but, as Aneau was quick to point out, the author's practice in *Olive* contradicts his theory. Du Bellay in fact adhered to conventional etymological standards of writing which were becoming fixed through print transmission. Pronunciations differed throughout France according to the region, class, and status of assorted users, but a normalized spelling could make sense to all readers, Latin educated or not. Thus Robert Estienne, joined by a majority of humanist printers in Paris, had advocated a standard of spelling according to word origins that stabilized the word's semantic nucleus in its graphic form. Peletier added another justification for etymological spelling: it would enable the French language and French ideas to be exported to other nations that shared Latinate learning, "de passer aux nations etranges" 'to pass to other nations.'[20]

In consequence Du Bellay could only concur that France's diversity of linguistic forms would best be served by an etymological rather than phonetic system of spelling. Such a system based upon an awareness of word origins would allow writers to experiment with both classical and regional counterparts of their language. It would expand the lexical range of a shared language by putting into active use words and phrases drawn from local occupations and pursuits, regional activities and professions, and specialized arts and sciences. French would grow from within itself as alternate expressions and forms might spring from different and distinctive sites of origin. This irenic view of language, dissolving antagonisms between spoken and written, regional and standard forms, could transfer to the literary domain as well. For all its advocacy of a French national style, Du Bellay's program in the *Deffence* recoils from grounding poetic practice in any totemic set of rhetorical conventions or constraints based upon earlier French norms. It instead urges a diversity of models drawn from classical and Italian literary history, while placing a taboo upon any endogamic appropriation of French models alone.

In this light Du Bellay's ambivalent commendation of Marot, Héroët, Saint-Gelais, and Scève in *Deffence* 2.2, reaffirmed in sonnet 62 of *Olive,* tightens their currency. Each of these writers possessed a refined style; each used his style to express an elevated set of topics, themes, and motifs; and each enriched his expression by reverting to classical and Italianate models. It is as though each had mapped out a special territory ripe for colonization so as to obviate direct competition with one another. Exogamic source hunting becomes the rule; confrontational rivalry becomes anathema. In the name of fraternal camaraderie Marot appropriates a popular lexicon, Héroët a philosoph-

ical one, Saint-Gelais a courtly one, and Scève a scientific one, each drawing upon classical and Italian models, none impinging upon the others. In their common purview a shared Petrarchism charts a site of interaction.

The work of Antoine Héroët is a case in point. Born into a distinguished family at Paris in the late fifteenth century, he benefited from a humanist education in Latin and perhaps Greek which set him apart from those serving the Crown with pedestrian notarial skills.[21] Héroët put this education to public and domestic use at the court of Marguerite de Navarre and in his associations with the bourgeois intellectual elite of Lyon. His most famous poem, *La parfaicte amye de cour* (1536), responds to the satiric *L'amye de cour* by Marot's favored disciple, Bertrand de La Borderie, and to a high-minded attack on it, *Contr'amie de cour*, by Charles Fontaine.[22] Condemning La Borderie's facile wit and Fontaine's equally facile moralism, Héroët opts for a distant recall of Petrarch. Appropriately, *La parfaicte amye* concludes with a bivalent double negative, "Dames, je vous promete / Qu'il n'adviendra, et il n'advint jamais, / Que vraye amour n'ayt esté reciprocque" 'Ladies, I promise you that it will never happen and has never happened that true love has/has not been reciprocated' (1653–55), even as it urges, "Faictes à luy de voz coeurs sacrifice" 'Sacrifice your hearts to Love' (1658). In his *Recueil de poésie* (November 1549; reprinted in March 1553) Du Bellay commends Héroët (addressed in a Marotic pun, "Heroet aux vers heroiques" 'Héroët in heroic verses' Ode 13.13]) for ejecting from his poetry banal figurations of Cupid and replacing them with elevated discourse: "Tu as rompu l'arc, et la trousse / Du jeune archer malicieux" 'You have snapped the scampish young archer's bow and bag of tricks' (Ode 13.29–30). For this reason, too, "non du victorieux laurier / Mais di pacifique olivier" 'not with the victorious laurel but with the pacific olive branch' (42–43), he merits the crown of wise Athena rather than the laurel of Petrarch.

Héroët's *L'androgyne de Platon* (1542) epitomizes a mode that Du Bellay admired. It constitutes a versified French paraphrase of Aristophanes' speech on the Hermaphrodite in Plato's *Symposium,* a text whose translation from Ficino's Latin into French by Loius Le Roy in November 1558 Du Bellay would embellish with translations from Greek poetry. The technical polish of Héroët's decasyllabic couplets, each honed to brilliance and addressed personally to François I, enhances the king's image of self-generative power:

> Syre, il vous fault en memoire reduire,
> Ce que scavez myeulx qu'on ne peult dire;
> C'est que l'amour est passion gentille,
> Nous esclayrant de flamme si subtille

> Que du ciel semble en terre demys,
> Pour esveiller les esprits endormys.
> (293–300)
>
> Sir, you must bear in mind what you know better than anyone could say: that love is a gentle passion illuminating us with so subtle a flame that it seems sent from heaven to earth to awaken sleeping spirits.

The poem's preface argues that every written word submitted to François should be wrought to perfection: "O Roy, premier des lettres amateur, / Rien ne lisez qui ne soit elimé" 'O King, foremost devotee of good writing, do not waste your time reading anything that is not finely polished' (16–17). It urges upon the nobility, and especially upon the royal household that serves the king, a style that would distinguish its users from those "qui de scavoir faisoyent si peu de compte / Auparavant, qui le tenoient à honte" 'who formerly put so little stock in education, who held it in shame' (57–58). In his patriotic call for a style that befits the king, Héroët merits inclusion in Du Bellay's canon.

Héroët's Neoplatonic focus would nonetheless limit his readership at a court set upon more worldly and seductive entertainments. The glittering ambience of Fontainebleau which François I was conjuring under the artistic direction of Giovanni Battista Rosso, Francesco Primaticcio, and Benvenuto Cellini, brought from Italy in the 1530s and 1540s, had prized virtuoso gesture and sumptuous self-display over philosophic substance.[23] Here pride of place in poetic composition went to Luigi Alamanni (1495–1556), a Florentine exile whom François I had supported at Fontainebleau from 1531 to 1538 and whose two-volume *Opere toscane* the king paid to have published at Lyon in 1532–33. Among his elegies, odes, satires, eclogues, and translations of Psalms—genres favored by Marot but not by Héroët—Alamanni includes 268 sonnets that narrate his exile from Florence, "l'almo terren doue infelice nacqui, / Il mio fiorito albergo, il mio bel nido" 'the sustaining land where I was born wretched, my flower-strewn shelter, my lovely nest' (sonnet 2, vol. 1, p. 188), and his refuge in France.[24]

Alamanni and other Italian émigrés at Fontainebleau set a standard against which native French poets might vent their nationalist aggression. The former's interests could not have differed more from Héroët's. Separated from his wife, who remains in Florence "così lontano / Della mia Flora" 'so far from my Flora' (sonnet 3, vol. 1, p. 189), Alamanni settles in Provence near "Valle chiusa, alti colli, & piagge apriche, / Che del Tosco maggior fido ricetto / Fuste alcun tempo" 'Vaucluse, high hills and sunny shore that once were the faithful shel-

ter of the greater Tuscan' (sonnet 25, vol. 1, p. 198). At once the site of Petrarch's enamorment and the point of Alamanni's arrival in François's kingdom, the location emblematizes the incorporation into French culture of Italian literary forms, with their accumulated Greco-Roman inheritance and their modern stylish refinement. Here the poet meets and falls in love with a Genovese noblewoman who cruelly rebuffs his suit, "Lyguria Pianta in le cui belle fronde / I miei dolci pensier s'han fatto nido" 'Ligurian plant in whose beautiful leafy branches my sweet thoughts have been nested' (sonnet 87, vol. 1, p. 232). Amid torrents of Petrarchan contrariety Alamanni now encounters "glorioso Francesco," the "magnanimo Re" who rewards his poetic labors: "O' gallico terren, largo ricetto / Di noi, che priui siam d'ogni altra bene" 'O Gallican land, generous shelter of us who are deprived of every other benefit' (sonnet 158, vol. 1, p. 268). Loose, luxe, and *un peu plumatif,* Alamanni pursues his craft without the slightest concern for any moral gravity attributed to Petrarch by his Italian commentators.[25] In this mannerist environment Héroët's poetry was bound to run a bit off the rails under the weight of its metaphysical concerns. When Du Bellay in *Deffence* 2.2 faults Héroët's philosophical style, he is no doubt referring to its mismatch with the regnant courtly aesthetic.

Fontaineblau found a better match for Alamanni's verse in the poetry of Mellin de Saint-Gelais, whom Du Bellay honors in sonnet 62 of *Olive* but criticizes in the *Deffence* 2.2 (and again in his *Recueil de poésie*) for his reluctance to publish: "Pourquoy donques si longue nuit / Veulx-tu sur tes labeurs estendre?" 'Why then do you want to stretch such a long night over your labors?' (*Recueil,* ode 3.61–62).[26] True, Saint-Gelais's fame grew through the circulation of his manuscripts at court, but he published a sizable corpus of epigrams, sonnets, and longer poems well before the *Deffence.*[27] Several of his poems appeared in the popular anthology published by Alain Lotrian in Paris in 1542 and 1543, *La fleur de poesie francoyse;* and sixteen of his chansons, including "Laissez le verde couleur," a lament of Venus for Adonis which secured Saint-Gelais's fame, appeared in a collective volume *Deploration de Venus sur la mort du bel Adonis,* assembled by Antoine Du Moulin at the press of Jean de Tournes in Lyon in 1545. In 1547 Pierre de Tours published at Lyon an unauthorized *Saingelais. Oeuvres de luy tant en composition que translation ou allusion aux auteurs Grecs et Latins.* A complete edition of his work appeared posthumously in 1574 at Lyon.[28]

Like Marot, Saint-Gelais had held royal appointments, the latter preeminently at Fontainebleau as royal librarian and at the Louvre as a career diplomat and *aumônier* of the Dauphin. Both Marot and Saint-Gelais wrote a great

deal of occasional verse addressed to prominent members at court, and both underwent periods of royal reprimand. Both finally imported classical and Italian forms as no earlier court poets had done, and each could lay some claim to having introduced the Petrarchan sonnet into France. Marot's "Sonnet à Madame de Ferrare," written at Venice in 1536, appeared in Etienne Dolet's edition of Marot's *Oeuvres* in 1538.[29] But a mediocre sonnet printed in the 1547 Lyon edition of Saint-Gelais's work, "Voyant ces montz de veue ainsi lointaine" 'Seeing these mountains from a view so distant' (sonnet 3, Stone ed.), may lay a yet earlier claim to composition. A note in the manuscript, "faict passant les mons" 'written crossing the mountains,' prompts one modern editor to speculate that it might date from Saint-Gelais's journey to Italy in 1518.[30] The poem offers a series of fairly stilted comparisons between the mountains' height and the speaker's love with a thematic contrast that distinguishes its sonnet structure from the linear rhetoric of an epigram: "Et d'eulx à moy n'a qu'une différance: / Qu'en eulx la neige, en moy la flamme dure" 'And between them and me there is only one difference: in them the snow, in me the flame persists.'

Under Alamanni's allure Saint-Gelais offered one of his sonnets when he presented a volume of Petrarch's *Rime sparse* to Charles, duke of Orléans, "Sonnet mis en le Petrarque de feu Monseigneur le duc d'Orléans" 'A sonnet inserted into a volume of Petrarch belonging to the late Duke of Orléans' (sonnet 6, Stone ed.). Composed before Charles's untimely death on 5 September 1545 but after the Treaty of Crépy exactly a year earlier which had awarded him the duchy of Milan as a dowry upon his marriage to the daughter of Spain's Charles V, it figures Petrarch's volume as an emblem of Italian territory annexed to France, "de vous voir couronné / Roy d'Italie" 'seeing you crowned king of Italy.' Just as Du Bellay would urge others to make the French language illustrious by appropriating Petrarch's work, so Saint-Gelais credits the duke of Orléans: "Et s'on vous voit, Monsieur, tant adonné / Au vray toscan, c'est ouvraige des dieux" 'And if we see you, Monsieur, so devoted to this Tuscan author, it is the work of the gods.' The *triomphes* that he stages ("Illustres tant de triomphes nostre age" 'Make our age illustrious with so many triumphs') fulfill the title of Petrarch's *Trionfi* inscribed in the presentation volume, so that even Petrarch now basks in French glory.

Both Saint-Gelais and Du Bellay must have regarded their work in contrast to that of Maurice Scève, the fourth poet criticized in *Deffence* 2.2 and commended in *Olive* 62 and one whose classical training and respect for vernacular learning and Petrarchan poetry exemplify the ideals set forth in the

Deffence.[31] A fluent Latinist, adept in composing French epigrams, blasons, eclogues, and prose romance but decidedly noncourtly and a spokesman for an elite bourgeois culture in Lyon, Scève exemplified the civic autonomy of his birthplace. As a royal city on the frontiers of France, Lyon was noted for its confluence of native artisans, merchants, and professionals with bankers, merchants, and professionals from Italy and with immigrants from Germany and the Low Countries involved in its printing industry and trade fairs.[32] With no university to impose censorship and no permanent secular or ecclesiastical courts to enforce restrictions, it conducted its cultural activities with the support of wealthy burghers, engaged professionals, enterprising publishers, and various coterie intellectuals.

Scève flourished in this cosmopolitan environment, spared from pressures that beset Du Bellay's stratified ranks of titled nobility. Born as the son of an affluent municipal officer, he had acquired a solid education (at least partly in Avignon, where he proclaimed his discovery of Laura's tomb).[33] He took minor orders and received a benefice that enabled him to pursue his intellectual interests. The result was Scève's concentration upon figurations and motifs with an "obscurité aussi difficile" which Du Bellay disparaged in *Deffence* 2.2.(95/35). Scève of course honored the French Crown, notably as a principal contributor to a volume on the death of the dauphin Charles in 1536, published by Etienne Dolet as *Recueil de vers latins et vulgaires . . . sur le trepas du feu Monsieur le Dauphin* (his contribution included five Latin epigrams, two French huitains, and the French eclogue *Arion*), and in a handful of dizains in *Délie* which recall recent political events.[34] But the focus of his national sentiment aims elsewhere.

Scève's *Délie* announces the arrival of an ambitious Petrarchism in France, one that psychologizes Petrarch's experience and the language that renders it, unbinding its energies in a prodigious display of verbal inventiveness. *Délie* 278, Scève's version of Petrarch's sonnet 248, "Chi vuol veder," signals this effort by substituting for Petrarch's emphasis on visual experience (*veder*) a new emphasis on intellective experience (*scauoir*) and audial competence (*ouyr*):

> Qui veult scauoir par commune euidence
> Comme lon peult soymesmes oblyer, . . .
> Vienne ouyr ceste, & ses dictz desplier
> Parolle saincte en toute esiouissance.

Whoever wishes to know by evidence obvious to all how one can forget oneself, . . . come hear her and explain what she says, holy word in every act of pleasure.

Significantly, the experience that *Délie* invites, "comment du corps l'Ame on peult deslyer" 'how one can detach soul from body,' is recorded in the verb *deslyer* (detach, unbind), which conjures the beloved's name. The speaker insists upon a perfect fusion of word and meaning in Délie's speech, "Parolle saincte," but his own displaced speech affirms the opposite for itself. Like its wholly human speaker, it inheres in a world of plural forms and divisible matter that resist changeless perfection, implying a ferocious, head-on, finally liberating compromise with the ideal that it aims toward.[35]

Inevitably, Scève gestures toward the vernacular styles of the *Roman de la rose* and the Rhétoriqueurs, and especially toward Clément Marot, who died a few months after the publication of *Délie* in the spring of 1544.[36] In the overwhelming majority of his dizains Scève uses Marot's favorite rhyme scheme (*ababbccdcd*).[37] And he echoes Marot directly in several key poems—for example, his first emblem poem, "Libre viuois en l'Auril de mon aage" 'I lived free in the April of my youth' (*Délie* 6), recalls Marot's "Tant que vivrai en age fleurissant / Je servirai Amour le dieu puissant" 'As long as I shall live in youth and health, I will serve the powerful god Love' (from chanson 9), as well as other poets whom Marot had canonized, including Jean Lemaire de Belges, Octovien de Saint-Gelais, and Jean Marot.[38] Scève's voice blends with Marot's and those of his predecessors, all of them readily identified with service to patrons, clients, king, and nation. From this nexus of allegiances radiates a glimmer of national sentiment that transcends ritual, pageantry, and abstract notions of patriotism.

Du Bellay evokes Scève at key points in *Olive*. Just as Scève opens *Délie* with "mes jeunes erreurs" 'my young wandering' in homage to Petrarch's "giovenile errore" (dizain 1), so Du Bellay opens his sequence disclaiming his search for "la fameuse courrone" 'the famous crown' in homage to Petrarch's laurel (sonnet 1).[39] From Scève, moreover, Du Bellay learned to confront the dark obsessional powers of eros and the abyss of memory, recalling not only these motifs but also such formal effects as ruptured parallelism and antithetical contrast. In sonnet 10, for example, a suite of correlative verses praising Olive's hair and eyes leads up to "l'heur et plaisir que ce m'est de perir" 'the joy and pleasure that it is for me to perish.' Barthélémy Aneau's complaint that "tout ce sonnet est de connexion mal jointe" 'this entire sonnet has a badly composed structure' could in fact describe such decentering effects that Scève regularly deploys, as in dizain 276, in which his speaker exults in a restraint "sinistrement esleu à mon malheur" 'perversely chosen for my own misfor-

tune.' Occasional verbal similarities between *Olive* and *Délie* based on shared Petrarchan conventions seal this relationship.[40]

My claim that national sentiment begins with loyalties to individual people and specific classes of people resonates in Du Bellay's panegyrics to Scève, Marot, and others. Sonnet 105 offers an apology for not singing Scève's praises more widely: "J'aime, j'admire et adore pourtant / La hault voler de ta plume dorée" 'I still love, admire, and worship the high flight of your golden wing.' In the sestet he compares the Saône River and Délie to the Arno River and Laura, implicitly contrasting Petrarch's remote Italian ancestry with Scève's French national sentiment:

> L'Arne superbe adore sur la rive
> Du sainct Laurier la branche toujours vive,
> Et ta Delie enfle ta Saone lente.
>
> The proud Arno adores on its shore the ever-living branch of its holy laurel, and your Délie swells your slow Saône.

Scève then disappears from the text, as Du Bellay concentrates upon his own effort to measure up to Petrarch:

> Mon Loire aussi, demy dieu par mes vers,
> Bruslé d'amour etent les braz ouvers
> Au tige Laureux, qu'à ses rives je plante.
>
> My Loire, too, exalted as a demigod through my verse, burnt with love, stretches its open arms to the happy shrub that I plant on its shores.

The lines echo a sonnet by Ercole Bentivoglio in the second volume of Gabriel Giolito's *Rime diverse* (1548) honoring Virgil, "il famoso figliuol del gran Benaco" 'the famous son of the great Benaco.' Just as Bentivoglio acclaims a classical precursor in a nonclassical fourteen-line form, so Du Bellay acclaims his French precursor in a form that the latter did not practice. And, although Scève had collapsed Petrarch's sonnet structure into ten-line epigrams using Marot's rhyme scheme, Du Bellay now reinstates the sonnet structure's more capacious dimensions. Sonnet 105 promotes Du Bellay's virtuosity. If one were to delete its second quatrain in praise of Scève, what remains would ironically be a ten-line epigram in the manner of *Délie* but with a focus on Du Bellay's relation to Petrarch. The poem dramatizes in miniature the emergence of the Petrarchan sonnet from the embryonic conjunction of the Marotic and the Scèvean epigram.

In the implied narrative of *Olive,* Du Bellay's *eloge* to Scève follows several poems that divulge personal rivalries, individual corruption, and human frailty in a corporeal as well as moral sense.[41] Sonnet 96 recounts the speaker's separation from his beloved ("Ne voyant point le Soleil qui m'eclere" 'Not seeing at all the sun that brightens me'), and the following poem marks the entry of an rival suitor ("Helas! on veult la mienne devorer" 'Alas! someone wants to devour mine'). In sonnet 98 someone slanders Olive's reputation ("S'il a dict vray" 'If he has spoken truly'). In sonnets 101 and 102 she appears vulnerable to a tempter's gifts: "Les haultz ramparts et les bandes armées / Donnent passage à l'or audacieux" 'high ramparts, and armed bands all give way before audacious gold.' In sonnets 103 and 104 she falls prey to a "fievre hardie, / Qui fais languir" 'strong fever that makes me languish.' In need of consolation the speaker expresses admiration for the "hault voler" 'high flight' of virtue promoted by Scève (sonnet 105) and the "doulces fureurs" 'sweet furors' of poetry extolled by Ronsard (sonnet 106).

The amity that Du Bellay professes for Scève repairs the fraternal wrangling projected around it. The remedy is an elevation of mind and spirit, a cultivation of personal loyalties, and a purging of the libidinal drives defined in Petrarch's sonnets.[42] The poet-lover of the *Rime sparse* finds release from his erotic obsessions in a turn to religious devotion. Du Bellay's poet-lover might hope for such release, but, in the climate of mid-sixteenth-century Reformist controversy and doctrinal dissent, the terms of religious consolation have changed. Sonnets 107 through 113 of *Olive* project a calendrical structure reminiscent of the *Rime sparse,* but they submit it to a new turn as they present the speaker's meditation on sacred themes during the chronology of holy week.[43] Against the bleak world of frailty and oppositional strife portrayed in sonnets 96 to 104, religion offers potential solace only if it ignores sectarian divisions threatening the French nation. At the beginning of *Olive* sonnet 5 reports that Love seized the speaker on Christmas night: "C'estoit la nuyt que la Divinité / Du plus hault ciel en terre se rendit" 'It was the night that Divinity brought Himself from highest heaven to earth.' Now, five poems from the end of *Olive,* sonnet 111 affirms that this love has grown from winter to spring as the poem marks Good Friday: "Voicy le jour que l'eternel amant / Fist par sa mort vivre sa bien aimée" 'Here is the day that the Eternal Lover through His death made his well-beloved live.' Sonnets 112 and 113 then broach the topic of predestination and salvation through divine grace. By working through its theological issues to accommodate sectarian differences, chiefly by displaying an Evangelical perspective conformable with Gallican and Roman orthodoxy,

the conclusion of *Olive* rises above the aggressive impulses of Calvinist conviction.

Sonnet 112 is modeled on Veronica Gambara's poetic paraphrase of St. Paul's discourse about divine will in his Epistle to the Romans 8:29–30, 35, "Scelse da tutta la futura gente / Gli eletti suoi l'alta bontà infinita" 'From the entire future race the Supreme Infinite Goodness chose his elect,' originally printed in Giolito's anthology.[44] Du Bellay's poem assesses the workings of free will and individual merit in a self-defined community:

> Dedans le clos des occultes Idées,
> Au grand troupeau des ames immortelles
> Le Prevoyant a choisi les plus belles,
> Pour estre à luy par luymesme guidées.

Within the precinct of hidden ideas, in the great throng of immortal souls, the Foreseer has chosen the most beautiful to be guided to him by himself.

Du Bellay identifies Gambara's foreordained *eletti* as "les plus belles" without precisely specifying either their election or the reason why they are *belles,* whether through God's will or their own merit. This refinement of the model dramatizes a reasoned difference between two sorts of divine will. The Almighty's antecedent will brings human beings to happiness through the consequent agency, *l'engin,* of their own effort, and so the latter become responsible for their own salvation:

> Lors peu à peu devers le ciel guindées
> Dessus l'engin de leurs divines aeles
> Vollent au seing des beautez eternelles,
> Où elle' sont de tout vice emondées.

Then little by little hoisted toward heaven upon the engine of their divine wings, they fly to the bosom of eternal beauties, where they are pruned of all vice.

As it reaches toward the realm of pure ideas, Du Bellay's poem evokes Petrarch's sonnet 362, "Volo con l'ali de' pensieri al Cielo" 'I fly with the wings of thought to Heaven.' The latter concludes with the words either of God or of Laura—exactly who is unclear—advising Petrarch that his long wait will seem short in the aspect of eternity:

> Responde:—Egli è ben fermo il tuo destino;
> et per tardar ancor vent'anni o trenta,
> parrà a te troppo, et non fia però molto.—

> He or she replies: "Your destiny is certain, and a delay of twenty or thirty years will seem much to you, but it will be little."

To Fausto da Longiano, Petrarch offers a mystical vision of eternity comprehended "in vn medesimo momento" 'in a single instant' (127[r]). For Gesualdo the idea of predestination seems only an illusion *sub specie aeternitatis*. Outside of time the very notion of foreordination loses meaning: "E non pero sara MOLTO di spatio all'eternita del tempo" 'However, it will not seem much of an interval in the eternity of time' (338[v]). In the mind of God all that is already has been and ever will be, honoring the scriptural ideal that we are all one in God's eyes, nobleman as well as commoner, king as well as courtier. From this perspective God seems less an interventionist in day-to-day life and more a distant, even inscrutable figure, opening space for an autonomous realm of human action that shapes society, culture, politics, *patria,* economics, and ultimately the nation's destiny.

Sonnet 113, calendrically linked with Easter Sunday in the structure of *Olive,* works toward a solution that promotes art on behalf of virtue. Daniello's model in Giolito's anthology, "Se 'l viver nostro è breve oscuro giorno" 'If our life is a short dark day,' in turn evokes Petrarch's sonnet 355, "O tempo, O ciel volubil" 'O time, O revolving heavens,' proposing the same motif with the same rhyme words: *mortali*/*strali* and *ali*/*mali.* Daniello's commentary describes the poem's situation as a reasoned debate: "Risponde hora il Poe. dicendo, Che non se ne parte, ma ben dal MALE, di lui medesimo, del corpo per cagione delquale l'anima sua fiero, e crudo martire sosteneua" 'Why do you wish to desert my troop? Petrarch responds that he flees not from Love but from the harm visited upon his body for which his soul sustains a fierce and cruel martyrdom' (199[v]). In Daniello's sonnet the interrogatives, "Che fai?" "Che non ti miri?" and imperatives, "scuotile," "le dispieghi," convert the speaker's initial hypothesis, "se 'l viver nostro è breve oscuro giorno," into an expression of fact. To this analytical argument Gesualdo's commentary on Petrarch's concluding verse in sonnet 355 adds rhetorical authority. When Petrarch writes, "Non a caso è vertue, anzi è bell'arte" 'Virtue is not by chance; rather it is a subtle art,' Gesualdo observes, "E quel, che no dichiamo Arte, apo i Greci significa uirtute, che si dice da lor arete" 'What we call "art" signifies for the Greeks "virtue," which they call "arete," from which our word "art" derives' (xxxlix[v]). *Arte* reflects *arete*.

Du Bellay's version offers its own self-conscious artistry as a remedy for social, professional, and religious strife:

Que songes-tu, mon ame emprisonnée?
Pourquoy te plaist l'obscur de nostre jour,
Si pour voler en un plus cler sejour,
Tu as au dos l'aele bien empanée?
Là, est le bien que tout esprit desire,
Là, le repos où tout le monde aspire,
Là, est l'amour, là, le plaisir encore.

What are you imagining, o my imprisoned soul? Why does the darkness of our day please you if you have on your back a well-feathered wing to fly to a brighter abode? There is the good that every spirit desires, there the repose to which everyone aspires, there is love and pleasure still.

The fivefold repetition of *là* imposes a sense of order upon the distant world which its speaker seeks to conquer—a world that contrasts with life here and now while echoing the anagrammatic significance of Scève's *Délie* as *l'idée* and the subtitle of his Petrarchan sequence, *Object de plus haulte vertu:* "Là, ô mon ame au plus hault ciel guidée! / Tu y pouras recongnoistre l'Idée / De la beauté, qu'en ce monde j'adore" 'There, o my soul, guided to the highest heaven you can recognize the Idea of beauty that I adore in this world below.'[45] Dark disorder yields to the vision of a new world, but only after it evokes the principle of vital energy instantiated in the philosophical poetry of Héroët and the courtly poetry of Saint-Gelais: "Là, est l'amour, là, le plaisir encore." Its rhythm subsumes the former's "passion gentille" and the latter's "la flamme dure" along with Scève's graphemic *Idée* and his play on *Délie* as *délit* (delight).[46]

One more contemporary belonging to this group is the Lyonnais poet Pontus de Tyard (1521–1605), a friend of Héroët and Scève who, like them, had absorbed the lessons of Saint-Gelais, Marot, and the Rhétoriqueurs.[47] By the time Du Bellay published the second edition of *Olive,* Tyard had published the first of his three collections of Petrarchan sonnets, *Les Erreurs amoureuses I* (in Lyon at the press of Jean de Tournes in November 1549, seven months after the *Deffence* and eleven months before the second *Olive*).[48] Tyard claims to have begun his *Erreurs* before the publication of Scève's *Délie* in 1544.[49] Its appearance surely certified him as an independent embodiment of the social and cultural program set forth in the *Deffence* and hence as a rivalrous match for Du Bellay on the site of his own theory and practice. Tyard's sonnet 42 in *Erreurs I,* for example, appears to rework Petrarch's sonnet 167, a poem about the effect of Laura's singing on the speaker. Tyard's version begins with a description of the beloved's performance—"Au maniment de ses deux mains mar-

brines / Dessus le lut ou dessous l'espinete" 'In the fingering of her two marmoreal hands upon the lute or spinnet'—but it ends with a statement of the speaker's helplessness: "Car il n'y ha creature en ce monde / En qui rigueur ou fierté tant abonde" 'For there is no creature in this world in whom so much severity or pride abounds.'[50] In the next chapter I will suggest that Du Bellay reworks Petrarch's same sonnet to trump Ronsard in poetic competition. For Tyard, however, it is as though the poet has embarked upon a literary divagation whose end he cannot foresee.[51] Sonnet 2 of *Erreurs I,* his version of Petrarch's "Chi vuol veder," announces his diffidence: "Qui veult savoir en quante et quelle sorte / Amour cruel travaille les esprits . . . / Qu'il vienne voire ma peine ardente et forte / En discourant ces miens piteux escris" 'Whoever wishes to know how much and what kind of cruel Love agitates my feelings . . . should come see my sharp burning pain as I expatiate in these sad writings.' Here the current of Petrarch's brooding upon his insufficient art meets the riptide of Tyard's venereal obsession, and the result is an anguished Neoplatonic reverie.

The impact of Tyard upon Du Bellay was reciprocal.[52] *Erreurs amoureuses I* influenced the Neoplatonism of some poems in the expanded *Olive* a year later. *Olive* in turn influenced Tyard's *Continuation des erreurs amoureuses* in 1551 and the *Erruers amoureuses III* in 1555. Modern criticism has made too much, however, of Du Bellay's Neoplatonism. Certainly his version wears a different texture from that of Tyard's. In sonnet 155 of *Les Regrets* Du Bellay would jocularly portray Tyard as the victim of his own rarefied impulses: "Thiard, qui as changé en plus grave escritture / Ton doulx stile amoureux, Thiard, qui nous as fait / D'un Petrarque un Platon" 'Tyard, who have shifted your sweet amatory style to a more serious form of writing, Tyard who have made for us a Plato out of a Petrarch,' urging at the end "Mais ne tenons les yeux si attachez en hault" 'But let us not hold our eyes so fixed on high.'

Du Bellay's imagination finds the concrete material deeds of history a more frequent and congenial topic than moral or metaphysical abstractions. His imagination achieves its limit in the densely concrete and historically thematized bipartite sonnet sequence of the poet's later years, *Les Antiquitez de Rome* and *Songe* (published on 3 March 1558). Here Du Bellay approaches something of the epic grandeur and vatic intensity that Peletier urged upon French literature.[53] *Les Antiquitez* and *Songe* contribute profoundly to his expression of French national sentiment by representing the Rome of Giolito's poets as a figure of waste, the ruins of an ancient empire which could only furnish a cautionary example for Charles V's modern empire. In both of Du Bellay's se-

quences the alternation of decasyllablic sonnets (the odd-numbered poems of *Les Antiquitez* and *Songe,* except for sonnet 31 of *Les Antiquitez*) with those composed in alexandrines (the even-numbered poems of both and sonnet 31 of *Les Antiquitez*) broadly recalls the alternation of hexameter and pentameter (or incomplete hexameter) lines in classical elegy, itself construed as a form of ruined or diminished epic.[54] In *Les Antiquitez* this alternation depicts the fall of ancient Rome. In *Songe* unmistakable references to Petrarch's canzone 323 evoke the history of Du Bellay's own century with the impending doom of the Roman papacy and the Hapsburg Empire. As a fused sequence, *Les Antiquitez* and *Songe* provide a historical meditation on the fall of Rome and, by implication, of its avatar, the Holy Roman Empire of Charles V, they justify a patriotic celebration of the *translationes studii et imperii* thence to France.

Sonnet 5 of *Les Antiquitez*, "Qui voudra voir tout ce qu'ont peu nature", for example, clearly echoes Petrarch's sonnet 248, its translation by Marot, and its transposition in sonnet 62 of *Olive.*[55] Although Petrarch's beloved is still alive and accessible to others, the speaker knows that death and time will steal her away: "Et venga tosto, perché Morte fura / prima i migliori" 'And let him come soon, for Death steals first the best.' The object of Du Bellay's poem no longer exists. Rome has already fallen victim to time and decay, and the speaker wonders whether any observer might sense its former glory:

> Qui voudra voir tout ce qu'ont peu nature,
> L'art, et le ciel (Rome) te vienne voir:
> J'entens s'il peult ta grandeur concevoir
> Par ce qui n'est que ta morte peinture.
>
> Whoever would like to see all that nature, art, and heaven have but little of, should come see you, Rome; I wonder whether he can conceive your grandeur by what is only your dead image.

To Petrarch's compound subject "Natura / e'l Ciel" Du Bellay has added a third term, "l'art," emphasized as the first word in the poem's second line. A further modification secures the emphasis on artistry by transforming the Italian verb *pò* (can) into the French substantive *peu* (little), evidently confusing *pò* with *poco.* The new construction forces an oxymoronic juxtaposition of *peu* with *tout:* nature, art, and heaven have but few (*peu*) of all (*tout*) the qualities that once abounded in Rome.

Les Antiquitez unfolds as a figural drama about the baneful effects of Rome's influence on the rise of modern nations. Charles had coveted Italy's incorporation into his domain as the conclusive symbol of continuity between

the ancient Roman Empire and his own Hapsburg version of it.[56] Augustus had claimed imperial sovereignty on behalf of an order and stability needed in a world devastated by civil war and the threat of barbarian invasions. So, with the jutting jaw of a would-be Caesar, Charles defended his claims to Naples, Milan, and the rest of Italy as a preemptive measure against Ottoman invasions from the south and Lutheran and Calvinist rebellions in the north. The sheer size of his empire nonetheless suggested to his enemies in France and northern Europe that it might be only a matter of time before his rule would collapse. As the lesson of ancient Rome had shown, imperial overreach gives way to a contamination of moral values, the dissolution of a political culture, and the administration's eventual absorption into the very set of bureaucratic institutions that it had created. The result would be a loss of identity insistently figured in *Les Antiquitez.*

Songe engages these ideas about chaos more enigmatically, reinscribing into startling new contexts the haunting details that Petrarch had woven into canzone 323.[57] Du Bellay's treatment suspends the apocalyptic energies of Petrarch's figurations of death in a dark allegory that traces the history of Charles V's phantom empire and the recent papacy. The principal targets within the latter appear to be the laxity of Clement VII (sonnet 11), the personal ambitions of Paul III (sonnet 12), the unscrupulous craving of Julius III which drove this pope to ally with Charles V (sonnet 13), the fragility of Marcellus II (sonnet 14), and the invidious designs of Paul IV, who detested Spain's presence in his native Naples and sought to eliminate it at any cost, leading to the ruin of both papacy and empire (sonnet 15).[58]

Echoes from Petrarch's canzone 323 reinforce this allegory in *Songe.*[59] In the alexandrine sonnet 12 of *Songe* a pack of savage fauns despoils a beautiful fountain that had risen in the center of a delightful garden, where "là sembloit que nature et l'art eussent pris peine / D'assembler en un lieu tous les plaisirs de l'oeil" 'it seemed that nature and art had taken pains to assemble in one place all the delights of the eye.' Fausto had allegorized the garden as a circle of learned humanists whom Cardinal Giovanni Colonna had assembled at his court: "COL Cardinale non haueuan luoco gl'indotti ne vbriachi, ne buffoni, ne giocolatori. MA nimphe e muse. Cioe dotti & I scientati" 'the ignorant and drunkards and fools and playboys had no contact with the cardinal, but rather the nymphs and muses, i.e., erudite and learned people' (211^{v}). Du Bellay could interpret the figure in a similar vein as evoking a brigade of poets and humanists. But he would also fold into it a general sense of political devastation as Daniello had suggested when he interpreted Petrarch's canzone as an al-

legory of human history: "In genere l'humana vita, breue, frale, e caduca" 'in general, human history: short, weak, transient' (186^{v}). Such devastation dominates sonnet 13 of *Songe* in the figure of the shipwreck openly attributed to Petrarch: "Plus riche assez que ne se monstroit celle / Qui apparut au triste Florentin" 'Richer still than ever seemed the ship that appeared to the sad Florentine.' The fall of Western culture envisioned here—"Je vy sous l'eau perdre le beau thresor" 'I saw the beautiful treasure lost underwater'—occurs as the concomitant of misguided nationalistic policies.

Although Du Bellay did not know it, the unholy alliance of Rome with Spain figured in *Songe* was at an end. In October 1555 a tired Charles V entrusted the rule of the Low Countries to his son Philip II, and the following January he entrusted to him the kingdoms of Spain and Naples and the colonies of New Spain. Pope Paul IV, eager to expel the Spanish from southern Italy, brought France back into the war. *Songe* hints darkly at the pope's aggressive action and links it not only to the downfall of Rome but also to the diminution of France. By the summer of 1557 Philip II had triumphed over French forces and confirmed his hold on Italy. At this point *Songe,* published the following spring, ends with dark portents. Bankrupt, the Valois monarchy concluded the peace at Cateau-Cambrésis in February 1559, abandoning two generations of ambitions in Italy and losing Corsica, Savoy, Navarre, and other territories in the bargain. Amid the celebrations that marked the marriage of Du Bellay's patroness, Marguerite de France, to Emanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, Henri II died from an accident in a ritual tournament, precipitating thirty-five years of political chaos and brutal civil war in France. The Gallican movement now met a fierce Catholic resistance from a powerful nobility with an ultramontane allegiance to the papacy. Others yielded to Calvin's dream of a holy commonwealth, which in turn met bloody opposition in the Wars of Religion. If *Songe* needed a mimetic alibi to warrant its dark *figurae,* history would provide it. Across France itself narcissisms of minor difference fueled by religious dispute were propelling contrary factions into civil strife.

7 *Mon semblable, mon frère*

Du Bellay and Ronsard

Sonnet 60 of *Olive,* the first in a suite of fifty-six new poems added in 1550, addresses Ronsard directly: "Divin Ronsard, qui de l'arc à sept cordes, / Tiras premier au but de la memoire" 'Divine Ronsard, who on your bow with seven strings aim as the first one at the target of memory.' At that time Ronsard had just made his debut with a *Hymne de France* (privilege November 1549; written for the newly crowned Henri II in praise of France, "aux belles villes, / Et son renom" 'with its splendid cities and its renown,' ll. 20–21) and *Les quatre premiers livres des Odes* (privilege 10 January 1550). Urging him to leave his placid birthplace near Vendôme beside the lesser Loir River, the sonnet summons Ronsard southward to the site of royal chateaux such as Amboise and Blois and, further downstream, to the site of Du Bellay's birthplace at Liré near Angers: "Laisse ton Loir haultain de ta victoire, / Et vien sonner au rivage de Loire" 'Leave your Loir, proud in your victory, and come sound your music on the shore of the Loire.' Sonnet 61 with the speaker's address to his own poetry ("Allez mes vers" 'Go my verse') and sonnet 62 with its national pantheon of French poets follow. The latter ends with an oblique commendation of Ronsard "qui a faict lire . . . / Le vieil honneur de l'une at l'autre lire" 'who has barely made us read the old honor and the one and the other lyre.' The collective involvement of these poems with Du Bellay's relationship to Ronsard and their respective Petrarchan origins raises questions of poetic identity (just what do both poets owe to their Italian predecessor?) and of larger patriotic purpose (what goals does each strive for as a French poet, and how do they differ?)[1]

Already the report that Du Bellay, echoing the formula of a pastoral invitation to poetic competition, is coaxing Ronsard to leave the Loir for the Loire and make legible a "vieil honneur" implies some difference between them. Their likeness diverges in their public and private personae. Du Bellay fantasizes for himself a social responsibility to speak on behalf of a greater corporate entity, the emergent French nation. Ronsard fantasizes only a personal ambition to triumph as premier court poet. Du Bellay highlights these differences most dramatically in the poems of *Les Regrets* which contrast his hardships abroad with Ronsard's ease at Henri II's court, but he also implies them in the new *Olive,* published at a stressful time in his life marked by the onset of tubercular illness, his failure to secure patronage from the king's sister Marguerite de France, and adverse criticism of his *Deffence* by Barthélemy Aneau.[2] Acknowledging Ronsard as a stupendously resourceful poet, Du Bellay finds himself acting out conflicts where previously there seemed to be none. Sonnet 60 frames this relationship with Ronsard in a Petrarchan context.

Here it would appear that personal loyalties and allegiances come undone as a progressively corporate national sentiment overtakes Du Bellay but not Ronsard, so that the poet of *Olive* begins to question his friend's dedication to patriotic ideals. Ronsard would encourage his own renown as a poet apart from the fray, resistant to the fissiparous tensions of public life. Two years after the expanded *Olive,* Ronsard published his first collection of sonnets, *Les Amours* (privilege September 1552), champing to respect the success of Du Bellay's Petrarchan debut. Significantly, the first poem in Ronsard's collection echoes Petrarch's sonnet 248, "Chi Vuol veder," and, equally significantly, it displaces the beloved as its object of attention, replacing her with the poet himself:

> Qui voudra voyr comme un Dieu me surmonte
> Comme il m'assault, . . .
> Me vienne voir: il voirra ma douleur,
> Et la rigeur de l'Archer qui me donte.

Whoever would see how a god overwhelms me as he attacks me, . . . should come to see me: he will see my suffering and the rigor of the archer who tames me.

Ronsard's self-display emerges as exceptional when compared with Scève's intellectual probing ("Qui veult scauoir par commune euidence" [*Délie* 278]), Tyard's quiet diffidence ("Qui veult savoir en quante et quelle sorte" [*Erreurs amoureuses* 2]), and Du Bellay's full-spirited rally in *Olive* (62). Du Bellay encompasses an entire poetic discourse that evokes Marot, Héroët, Saint-Gelais,

and Scève as well as Ronsard. But Ronsard encompasses a discourse that evokes the merit of his own poetic achievement, an extravagant achievement that surpasses theirs.[3]

Forecasting their divergent careers, the "Divin Ronsard" of Du Bellay's sonnet 60 is a "fameux harpeur et prince de noz odes" 'famous harpist and prince of our odes,' rival of Pindar and Horace and initiator of "les plus nouvelles modes" in French poetry. He is also, of course, the friend who encouraged Du Bellay to join him in an elite classical education with Dorat at the Collège de Coquerert, the friend who sprang from the ranks of the lesser nobility eager to improve his station in courtly service, the friend who exemplified what the cultural program of the *Deffence* could best accomplish.[4] When Du Bellay compares his own poetry with Ronsard's, he conveys a twinge of inadequacy by echoing Petrarch's sonnet 20, "ma trovo peso non da le mie braccia" 'but I find a weight that is not for my arms,' and he asks Ronsard to help him:

> Porte pour moy parmy le ciel des Gaulles
> Le sainct honneur des nymphes Angevines,
> Trop pesant pour mes foibles epaules.
>
> Bear for me within the heaven of the Gauls the holy honor of the Angevin nymphs, too weighty for my weak shoulders.

Du Bellay's echo is apt. Early modern commentators on the *Rime sparse* situate Petrarch's complaint in a literary crisis. Filelfo, for example, surmises that the poet is agonizing about writing "qualche singular opra o in rima uulgare o in uersi litterali" 'some exceptional work either in vernacular rhyme or in learned [i.e., Latin] verse' (26^{v}). As the commentator explains, Laura deserves Latin elegiacs, but Petrarch has barely the skill to celebrate her in Italian rhymes: "Se lei fusse da quello poeta tanto amata quanto si dicea ella se ne sarebbe aveduta per qualche bella opra scripta in sua commendatione. Il che ne per uersi litterali: ne per rime uolgare si uedeua esser facto" 'If she had been loved by this poet as much as he says, this love would have been made public in some beautiful work of poetry written to commend her; which seemed to have been done neither in Latin verse nor in vernacular rhyme' (27^{r}).

Just as Petrarch's accomplishments in the vernacular jostle with his preferment of Latin, so do Du Bellay's. In the "Ad lectorem" concluding his Neo-Latin elegies in the *Poemata* (March 1558), the French poet compares his vernacular poetry to a wife, "Gallica Musa mihi est, fateor, quod nupta marito" 'The French muse is to me, I confess, what a wife is to a husband,' but he associates his Latin poetry with an alluring mistress, "Pro Domina colitur Musa

Latina mihi" 'As my mistress I cherish the Latin muse,' and he declares facetiously that "illa quidem bella est, sed magis ista placet" 'The former is indeed pretty, but the latter pleases me more.'[5] In *Olive* he confronts a more complicated choice. It is not between Latin or the vernacular but between styles of the vernacular clamoring for admission to the national canon—a high style displayed in Ronsard's odes and a less exalted middle style represented by Du Bellay's Petrarchan sonnets.

The next two poems, sonnets 61, "Allez, mes vers, portez dessus voz aeles," and sonnet 62, "Qui voudra voir le plus precieux arbre," refer to Petrarch's sonnets 247 and 248. Gesualdo notes that the latter ("Chi vuol veder quantunque pò natura") logically completes the former, since there the poet summons a broad readership to acknowledge Laura's excellence: "Assai diceuolmente risponde questo al Son. di sopra: pero che hauendo inuitato coloro à cui perauentura parea errante forse il suo stile in loder M.L. che à ueder l'andassero" 'This sonnet responds fittingly enough to the preceding one [in which he] invited those to whom his style in praise of Laura might have seemed in error, that they should come to see her' (293^{v}). Likewise, Du Bellay links sonnets 61 and 62 by addressing a compliant French readership:

> Mais s'il ne veult ou ne peult concevoir
> Ce que je sen', souhaitez luy de voir
> L'heureux object, qui m'a faict malheureux.
>
> But if he will not or cannot imagine what I feel, bid him look at the happy object who has made me unhappy.

Commentators read the Petrarchan model from a similar perspective. Squarzafico speculates that Petrarch is recounting Laura's charms to Bernardo Visconti, ruler of Milan. When Bernardo denies that Laura can be so beautiful or virtuous, the poet assumes the burden of rhetorical proof: "Et stando il petrarcha a milano ogni fiada diceua di questa sua madonna laura et di le sue grande bellezze e virtude: doue il predicto signore messer Bernabo gli diceua non poter esser cosi bella ne di tanta virtude come esso per suoi versi la faceua" 'When he was in Milan, Petrarch spoke all the time about Laura and her great beauty and virtue; whence Signor Bernardo said that she could not be so beautiful nor of such virtue as he made her seem in his poetry' (K^{5}). Antonio da Tempo also questions the efficacy of Petrarch's rhetoric. In order to persuade readers of Laura's excellence, the poet heightens his Italian style: "Quello ove questi aspira / è cosa da stancare Atene, Arpino, / Mantova et Smirna, et l'una et l'altra lira" 'What this man aspires to would exhaust Athens, Arpinum,

Mantua, and Smyrna, and the one and the other lyre.' Here the place names metonymically evoke ancient masters of oratory, Demosthenes and Cicero, and of epic, Virgil and Homer, assumed to have been born there, while "l'un et l'altra lira," the phrase that Du Bellay would apply to Ronsard, summons ancient masters of lyric, Pindar and Horace.

Petrarch's commentators applaud the poet's annexation of these ancient masters. According to Fausto, "per li poeti lirici, greci, e latini in questo stile si dipingeno le bellezze del corpo" 'through the Greek and Latin lyric poets her corporeal beauties are depicted in this style' (91^{v}). Pindar and Horace offer particularly rich resources, but as supreme archetypes they summon competitive national sentiments: Pindar contended with Stesichorus and Simonides, while Horace tried to surpass Pindar in his patriotic odes. Creative and professional rivalry ought to spur literary talent, but Du Bellay's encounter with Ronsard threatens to derail his talent. Ronsard has achieved an excellence able to surpass that of Pindar and Horace, but Du Bellay is still laboring to equal Petrarch. Daniello offers some useful advice. Petrarch knew that his style could not represent Laura in her fullness, but he also knew that every other style falls short, too: "Non pure il suo stile non è bastante, à tanto lodarla, quanto si conuerrebbe; ma che ne quello di tutti i piu eccellenti scrittori, che fossero giamai" 'Not only is his own style insufficient to praise her, but also that of all the best writers who ever lived' (148^{r}–48^{v}). As Daniello sees it, Petrarch strengthened his style by drawing as much as he could from powerful earlier examples, not only from the Latin poets but from his Stilnovisti precursors as well.

The second tercet of sonnet 62 evokes Ronsard as "cetuy là qui naguere a faict lire / En lettres d'or gravé sur son rivage / Le vieil honneur de l'une et l'autre lire" 'that one who has barely made us read in golden letters engraved upon its shore the old honor of the one and the other lyre.' Its classicizing figures inscribe his activity with a pun on his teacher's name (*d'or, Dorat*) but also with an echo from Petrarch's sonnet 93, "Scrivi quel che vedesti in lettere d'oro" 'Write what you have seen in letters of gold.' The echo of "l'una et l'altra lira" which identifies Horace and Pindar in Petrarch's sonnet 247 implies that Du Bellay is taking possession of Petrarch in his own French verse, but it also implies that Ronsard has superseded him and has already installed himself among the latter's ancient models. A rhyming pun upon *lire* (read) and *lyre* (lyre) seals Ronsard's custody. His oral-aural performance upon the lyre is really a literary performance designed to be read ("a faict lire"). In his *Deffence* Du Bellay had urged his contemporaries to adapt foreign literary forms, but even now this other, possibly greater poet is plumping to surpass him in this

art. Even Ronsard's name shares the etymology of Petrarch's, as both *Pierre* and *Petrarca* derive from *petros* (stone).[6]

Sonnet 94 of *Olive* signals Du Bellay's possession of Petrarch in a particular way. Among all his poems it represents the most direct of his borrowings from the *Rime sparse* as a literal translation of Petrarch's sonnet 167. Here is Petrarch's first quatrain:

> Quando Amor i belli occhi a terra inchina
> e i vaghi spiriti in un sospiro accoglie
> co le sue mani, et poi in voce gli scioglie,
> chiara, soave, angelica, divina.

> When Love inclines those beautiful eyes toward earth, collects her straying breath into a sigh with his own hands, then frees them in her song, so clear, angelic, gentle, and divine.

And here is Du Bellay's version, in which the rhyme *incline/divine* reproduces *inchina/divina* and *assemble/desassemble* renders *accoglie/scioglie:*

> Quand voz beaux yeulx Amour en terre incline,
> Et voz espriz en un soupir assemble
> Avec' ses mains, et puis les desassemble
> D'une voix clere, angelique et divine.

> When Love bends to the earth your beautiful eyes and gathers your spirits in a sigh with his own hands and then unbinds them in a clear, angelic, and divine voice.

As the poem dramatizes the beloved's performance of a song, it shows how her artistry (and Petrarch's) affects the speaker, how he actively responds, and how the event figures an act of poetic competition. For Petrarch's commentator Fausto da Longiano, Laura's song has an explicitly French patriotic significance. Fausto situates the action of Petrarch's poem at the court of Avignon in France, where Laura demonstrates her talent as a musician, a talent that Fausto associates with a French national attribute: "Ancor che tutte le francese habbiano da natura molta harmonia nello voce, nondimeno qui pone L. haver arte, e non solamente di musica vocale, ma anche instrumentale" 'Even though all the French have by nature a great vocal harmony, this poem shows that Laura also has a special talent for instrumental as well as vocal music' (61^{v}).[7] Du Bellay might readily endorse such remarks about French musical talent, but he would also endow them with a complex character. Olive, like Laura, is French, and her song echoes French art too, thereby rivaling Laura and initiating a competition within national boundaries. But the poem is not

just about the talents of French women. It also concerns the talent of a French poet such as Du Bellay to surpass the Italian poet whom he imitates as well as other French poets who will imitate him, including his friend Ronsard.

Ronsard's assimilation to Horace and Pindar announces his own competitive ambitions. In his four books of *Odes* he insists upon linking his technical competence to theirs and declaring his superiority over all his contemporaries. To Marguerite de France and her intimate circle he boasts that he sings in a new fashion evocative of the Greeks and Romans rather than of "poëtes barbares" 'barbarian rhymsters' (*Odes* 1.3.9–10).[8] Alluding to such court poets as Saint-Gelais, who had vied with him for her patronage and attention, he puts them in competition with himself and Du Bellay in ode 1.9. It is as a contest of crows ("Eux égualés à nos chants beaus, / Ils sont semblables aus corbeaus" 'Compared to our beautiful songs, they seem like crows') against the eagles of himself and Du Bellay at the site of royal power, "contre deus aigles, qui aguetent / (Portans la foudre du grand Roi)" 'against two eagles who stand at watch bearing the thunderbolt of their great king' (53–57).[9] Nor does Marot, though dead, escape unimpugned. Addressing François de Bourbon in ode 1.5, Ronsard disparages Marot's efforts to record the battle of Cerisoles in a poem that "ne sufit / Pour eternizer ta gloire" 'did not suffice to eternize your glory' (3–4). Here Ronsard brags that he can surpass Marot's crude effort, "attendant la main parfaite / D'un ouvrier ingenieuz" 'awaiting the perfect hand of an inspired craftsman' (9–10).[10] Through the intervention of Michel de l'Hôpital and Jean de Morel in 1553, Ronsard would mend his quarrel with Saint-Gelais, but his retraction exudes just a whiff of self-congratulation as he compares his anger to that of a semidivine Achilles against Saint-Gelais's older, hypertrophic, vaguely incompetent Agamemnon, "lors que plus l'ardante colere / Achille enfloit contre son Roi" 'when burning anger puffed up Achilles against his king' (*A Mellin de Saint-Gelais* 38–39).[11]

Sonnet 58 of *Les Amours* (1552) answers sonnet 60 of *Olive,* "Divin Ronsard," by praising Du Bellay's technical skills:

> Divin Bellay, dont les nombreuses loix,
> Par une ardeur de peuple separée,
> Ont revestu l'enfant de Cytherée.[12]
>
> Divine Bellay whose metrical laws, by an ardor distanced from the masses, have reclothed the Cytherean's babe.

Du Bellay had asked for help in spanning "le ciel des Gaulles" 'the heaven of the Gauls,' but Ronsard narrows the site of his friend's far-reaching ambition

to one that is "du peuple separée" 'distanced from the masses.' Ronsard, in effect, describes his own goal, not Du Bellay's. In his *Odes,* for example, Ronsard's ambitions focus on the word *race.* Derived from *radix* (root) and signaling family lineage prior to any broader ethnic or national identity, the word registers his preeminence over Horace, who "basse & lente avoit l'audace, / Non pas moi de franche race" 'displayed a low-born, slow audacity; not like me, of high-born stock' (*Odes* 1.9.171–72).[13] In *Odes* 3.14 he implies that comparing him to Pindar will redound to Du Bellay's glory—"Et je sonnerai ta louange" 'And I will sound your praise' (46)—as he exalts the latter's famous kinsmen, Jean and Guillaume du Bellay: "Car il semble que nostre lire / Ta race seulle vueille elire" 'For it seems that our lyre would choose your stock alone' (49–50).[14] In this formulation Du Bellay achieves a national recognition through his kinship with an illustrious clan, but Ronsard earns even greater recognition in a line of descent from ancient poets. Right from the start Ronsard seeks higher glory than any to which his friend has aspired.[15] At this point their parallel paths appear to diverge. Their classical education, their class-defined goals as upwardly mobile minor nobility, their investments in an ideology that identifies language, king, and nation, engender real differences.

In this light Ronsard's designation of Du Bellay as "du peuple separée" acquires an antithetical and even polemical coloration. Du Bellay's summoning of a broad cultural community capable of "toute vertu, tout honneur, toute sorte / De bonne grace et de facon gentile" 'all virtue, all honor, every sort of good grace and gentle manners' as he urges in sonnet 69, makes Ronsard's focus on an elite readership seem dwarfish by comparison. Ronsard has bitten into the apple of the good life at court, and he no longer craves a widespread readership. The latter replies by making Du Bellay's concerns seem even smaller. In sonnet 58 he acknowledges that his friend is possessed by fire, but it is a "doulx feu" 'gentle fire,' and his demeanor is "chaste," in which *doulx feu* echoes *douteux* (doubtful) and reduces his abstinence to a monochromatic restraint: "Si le doulx feu dont chaste tu ardoys / Enflamme encor ta poitrine sacrée" 'If the gentle fire in which you burn chaste, still enflames your sacred breast.' Ronsard imputes to himself an engagement with the fury of the real world, in this case immersion in the rip and rancor of a hot Petrarchan desire: "Oy ton Ronsard, qui sanglotte & lamente, / Paile, agité des flotz de la tourmente . . . / En fraisle nef, & sans voyle, & sans rame" 'Hear your Ronsard, who sobs and laments, grows pale, vexed by streams of torment . . . in a fragile boat without sail or oar.' From this perspective Du Bellay writes tame poetry, while Ronsard, burning for Cassandre, is charged with a greater energy.

Or so Ronsard would like it to appear when he uses the Petrarchan trope of shipwreck to figure his public performance.[16]

Du Bellay, withdrawn in his study, experiences none of these passions, although within a few years he would enter the realm of high politics when he accompanied Cardinal Jean du Bellay to the papal court in Rome. Ronsard, in truth, exaggerates his own public commitments. Nor would he exercise them very much before (upon strong pressure from the crown) finally denouncing Calvinist insurgence in his verse *Discours des miseres de ce temps* (1562), an oratorical poem figuring religious activism in the myth of *Opinion*, daughter of *Presumption*.[17] Sonnet 91 of *Les Amours* nonetheless implies Ronsard's political involvement when it addresses sonnet 83 of *Olive*. The genealogy of both poems evokes a model in Giolito's *Rime diverse* with a source in Petrarch as interpreted with an anti-Avignonese bias by sixteenth-century commentators. It is a sonnet by Antonio Francesco Rinieri which poses a rivalry between the radiance of the beloved and the sun: "Era tranquillo il mar . . . / Scuotea l'aurora da capegli aurati / Perle" 'The sea was tranquil. . . . Dawn shook out pearls from its golden hair.' As the beloved appears, the sun spreads its "raggi da i liti Eoi ricchi odorati" 'rays from the rich, fragrant eastern shores.' The sun and stars now pale by comparison: "E impalladio l'Orientale imago" 'And the orient image turned pale.' In Du Bellay's sonnet 83 the stars likewise fade when the beloved appears ("Déjà la nuit en son parc amassoit / Un grand troupeau d'etoiles vagabondes" 'Already night was gathering into its enclosure a large flock of vagabond stars'), and she becomes a figure for the poet's place of birth, the valley of the Loire evoked explicitly as "O flueve mien":

> Quand d'occident, comme une etoile vive,
> Je vy sortir dessus ta verde rive
> O fleuve mien! une Nymphe en rient.
> Alors voyant cete nouvelle Aurore,
> Le jour honteux d'un double tient colore
> Et l'Angevin, et l'Indique orient.
>
> When from the west, like a bright star, I saw emerge upon your green bank, o my river, a Nymph all laughing. Then, seeing this new Dawn, the day, ashamed, colors with a double hue both the Angevin and Indian east.

Here the Loire embodies the center of Du Bellay's universe, a site that commands the splendors of day and night, east and west, India and all France.

Rinieri's poem, and ultimately Du Bellay's and Ronsard's, refers to Petrarch's sonnet 115, "In mezzo di duo amanti honesta altera / vidi una donna"

'Between two lovers I saw a virtuous and haughty lady.' Here the sun and the speaker are rivals for Laura's attention: "Et da l'un lato il Sole, io da l'altro era" 'And on the one side was the sun, I on the other.' When Laura shifts her attention to the speaker, he delights in victory: "Poi che s'accorse chiusa da la spera / de l'amico più bello, agli occhi miei / tutta lieta si volse" 'When she saw that she was blinded by the sphere of her more handsome friend, she turned all happy to my eyes.' The sun consequently hides in shame behind a rain cloud that figures his defeat: "Un nuviletto intorno ricoverse: / cotanto l'esser vinto li dispiacque" 'A little cloud covered over, it so displeased him to be vanquished.' If we trace the filiations between Rineri's poem and Petrarch's through sixteenth-century commentaries on the latter, we can see the relevance of this model for Du Bellay and Ronsard at the time of reformist perturbation.

Petrarch's poem specifies no setting, site, or regional locality for its action, but its fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentators try to identify one. With their Reformist sympathies, Fausto da Longiano, Antonio Brucioli, and Lodovico Castelvetro note that the preceding poem, sonnet 114, attacks the papal curia at Avignon, "De l'empia Babilonia ond' è fuggita / ogni vergogna" 'From wicked Babylon, deserted of all shame.' Echoing Luther's roiling descriptions of sixteenth-century Rome, where "the pope creates a state of affairs that beggars description," these commentators fashioned a narrative that links sonnet 115 to the poems that precede and follow it.[18] Fleeing the depravity of papal Avignon, Petrarch finds solace at Vaucluse. Fausto recalls that in sonnet 113, "Qui dove mezzo son, Sennuccio mio" 'Here where I only half am, my Sennuccio,' Petrarch is telling his friend Sennuccio that he will leave Avignon: "MEdesimamente scriue a senuccio, & dice esser mezzo" 'Likewise he writes to Sennuccio and says that he is only half a man' (42^{v}). Brucioli deduces that Petrarch is addressing his friend from his home in Vaucluse: "Scriue di Valclusa à Senuccio suo amico, & monstra che quando si parti di Auignone, hebbe sempre cattiuo tempo per la uia" 'He writes from Vaucluse to his friend Sennuccio and claims that, after he left Avignon, he encountered foul weather along the way' (83^{v}). In sonnet 114 the poet assails papal corruption at Avignon, "rittratosi," as Fausto claims, "in disparte alla sua valchiusa" 'depicted at a distance from his own Vaucluse' (43^{r}). Castelvetro concurs in his account of the narrative.

Petrarch's removal to Vaucluse separates him from his beloved, who remains at Avignon. According to Fausto, the poet spends his days at Vaucluse thinking about Laura. In sonnet 115 he recalls gazing into the windows of her house

at Avignon: "IL P. si trouo essere ad vna fenestra, in vna casa contigua alla sua donna: essa medesimamente era ad vn'altra fenestra, & il sole gia coi suoi raggi discorrendo per il cielo era peruenuto" 'Petrarch finds himself at a window in a house near his lady's; she was at another window; the sun with its rays traversing the sky had already come between them' (43[r]). According to Castelvetro, the poet carries these memories to Vaucluse in sonnet 116: "Racconta come viene pieno di quella dolcezza medesima, che prese il primo di, che la vide" 'He recounts how he arrived [at Vaucluse] full of the same sweetness that he felt the first day he saw her' (209). Sonnet 117 concludes the action by describing the environs at Vaucluse, "a Babel le spalle" 'its back turned to Babel.'

Du Bellay's evocation of his ancestral Loire develops this Petrarchan topos with a sense of the moral discomfiture suggested by Fausto, Brucioli, and Castelvetro. The Loire represents for him a retreat from clamorous affairs in Paris and especially from rising pressures associated with the reform movement, with Henry II's antagonistic relationship to Rome, and with expedient incentives for France to aid the German Protestants against Charles V. Hence the religious trauma that Petrarch's proto-Protestant commentators attributed to the Avignon papacy recurs in a new, strangely potent guise for Du Bellay. With antagonisms between the Gallican-Evangelist Montmorency faction, to which the poet and Cardinal Jean du Bellay belonged in 1550, and the rival Ultramontane Papalist Guise faction, to which Ronsard belonged under the patronage of Cardinal de Lorraine, hostility quickly exceeded doctrinal dissent and acquired a social and political import of crisis proportions.[19] The task for both church and crown in France was to reconcile their differences in a pragmatic *politique* or resort to compromise by reason of state rather than by the demands of conscience.[20]

Increasingly wary of institutional politics in Paris, Du Bellay sought a capacious representation of France honoring its regional centers and the merits of his ancestral estate in the lower Loire Valley. Paris meant for him the historical domination of the conservative Sorbonne theologians and an opportunistic locus of activity for ambitious interest groups among the nobility and the bourgeoisie. Ronsard had prospered in this milieu and progressively acquired a patronage that would enable him to continue his work. Du Bellay found to his dismay that Ronsard could not or would not detach himself from these narrow environs. Although Ronsard had advertised himself as native "Vendômois" when he published his first four books of *Odes* with *Le Bocage* in 1550 and *Les Amours* in 1552 and 1553, he would soon throw himself into the local intrigues at Henry's court now situated at Paris. And, though in 1547 Ron-

sard had received a degree from the University of Paris, he quickly abandoned the city's scholastic and academic culture for a Hellenized vision of civic progress promoted in the *Odes,* seeking its literary analogue in the coterie forms of the Greek Anthology, the formal epic, and the elegiac poetry of Imperial Rome.[21]

Certainly, sonnet 91 of *Les Amours,* a reply to Du Bellay's sonnet 83, deploys its reminiscences of classical texts in anticipation of Ronsard's later direction. The poem begins with Ovidian echoes that describe dawn's glowing hair: "De ses cheveulx la rousoyante Aurore / Eparsement les Indes remplissoyt" 'With her hair, rosy dawn was here and there filling the Indias.'[22] Here the beloved's golden hair outshines her rival: "L'or, qui jaunissoit, / Le crespe honneur du sien eblouissoit" 'Her gold, which cast a yellow glow, dazzled dawn's curled honor.' In the sestet Aurora multiplies and regenerates nature's elements as her sighs "enfanterent des ventz, / Sa honte un feu, & ses yeulx une pluye" 'engendered wind, her shame heat, and her eyes rain.' All nature expands in response to the beloved's excellence, expressing itself in transfers of metonymy which unfold in slow motion. Envy, it would seem, provokes nature's sympathies in a riot of promiscuous imitation.[23] Not the least sort of promiscuity is that in 1555 Ronsard's commentator Marc Antoine Muret identifies the poem's addressee as someone other than Cassandre, possibly Marguerite de France, whose patronage Du Bellay sought: "Quiconque soit celle, pour qui ce Sonnet, & un autre encor, qui est dans ce liure, ont esté faits, elle a nom Marguerite. D'où ie collige, que les Poëtes ne sont pas tousiours si passionnez, ne si constans en amour, comme ils se font" 'Whoever it might be for whom this sonnet, and one other as well, have been composed, she bears the name Marguerite; whence I recall that poets are not always so impassioned nor so constant as they pretend to appear.'[24]

A good part of Ronsard's invention comes from a spontaneous combustion between Petrarchan form and eros. Commentaries on the *Rime sparse* may suggest its origins. Vellutello, Gesualdo, Sylvano da Venafro, and Bernardino Daniello, for example, define Petrarch's text as a site of literary allusiveness and rhetorical figurations full of variety, fluidity, mutability, and diversity. Vellutello links sonnet 115 with sonnets 111, 183, 116, 112, and 117 in a new order that reenacts the myth of Daphne's transformation into a laurel bush as narrated by Ovid in book 1 of the *Metamorphoses,* "alludendo a la fauola di Daphne, laqual fu amata dal sole, per essersi trasformata in lauro, del cui arbore M.L. portaua il nome" 'alluding to the story of Daphne who, loved by the sun, was transformed by it into a tree of that name, i.e., laurel' (26^{v}). Syl-

vano da Venafro endorses this transformation as "ingegnoso & tutto pieno di acutissime fantasie: & con marauigliosa descrittione" 'ingenious, full of the most subtle imaginings and with marvelous powers of description' (LXXXXIV^{v}). Gesualdo notes among its literary analogues not only Ovid but also Greek poets such as Anacreon and, as a precursor of its mythological formulations, Hesiod: "Come interpreta il Minturno nel Panegirico, Dogni mortal, d'ogni possente Iddio Doma la mente col suo bel disio" 'As Minturno interprets Hesiod in his Panegyric, "Of every mortal, of every powerful god, Love dominates the mind with his beautiful desire"' (CLV^{v}). Daniello concludes with the startling speculation that the narrative unfolds "in vna casa, e forse in vna chiesa, ove anchora si truouò M.L." 'perhaps in a house, perhaps in a church, where he again encountered Laura' (76^{v}–77^{r}). The religion at stake, however, is not Christianity—Roman, Reformed, or Evangelical—but the ambivalent, esurient, forever tumultuous cult of love, whose high priest is Ovid, cited by Daniello as Petrarch's authority, "Regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos" 'Love's throne and law are over even the gods who are lords of all' (*Heroides* 4.12).

Ronsard's virtuoso management of classical allusion seems calculated to display his brilliant technical skill. The contest between him and Du Bellay points less to a struggle for primacy within their brigade than to different convictions about addressing multiple national audiences. Du Bellay held few aspirations to leadership, but he did care greatly about the public effect of his poetry. Like Ronsard, he valued his courtly readership, but he recognized the impact that, through various intermediaries, such an elite readership could have on a broader populace. Ronsard's emphasis on elegance, wit, and novelty of expression signaled a gravitation toward a more select readership than Du Bellay had envisioned. Such exclusivity could only deepen the isolation that Du Bellay cautioned against in the *Deffence.* Literary history has strangely reversed the flow, so that in our own time Ronsard, now valued as the finer artist, has the greater number of editions and selections in anthologies. But in the sixteenth century it was Du Bellay who passionately urged the widest possible circulation. His effort to equip a regenerated aristocracy with a education in the classics insists upon the latter's full inclusion in the public sphere.

Ronsard's distance from the populace represents a breach of faith from Du Bellay's credo. Sonnet 106 of *Olive* hints at this apostasy. Addressing Ronsard, "O noble esprit, des Graces allié" 'O noble spirit, united with the graces,' Du Bellay recognizes an intense affinity with his friend, "O de mon coeur la seconde moitié" 'O second half of my own heart,' alluding to Horace's commen-

dation of Virgil in *Odes* 1.3.8 as "animae dimidium meae" 'half my soul.' But he also questions Ronsard's *hauteur.* Du Bellay appears tormented and agitated, hemmed in by exigencies that the other does not encounter, and so, in an act of self-deprecation which Ronsard would duplicate in "Divin Bellay," he asks for comfort: "Soulage un peu le torment que j'endure" 'Relieve a bit the torment that I undergo.' Ronsard calibrates a *furor poeticus* that inspires ecstatic visions of dynamic possibility.[25] Du Bellay runs short of this furor, implicitly contrasting himself as a technician-poet of modest resources with Ronsard as a superior poet of unbridled imagination and linguistic inventiveness: "Inspire moy les tant doulces fureurs / Dont tu chantas celle fiere beauté" 'Breathe into me such sweet furors with which you sing of this proud beauty.' In his sonnet 58 addressed to "Divin Bellay," Ronsard construed "le doulx feu dont chaste tu ardoys" 'the gentle fire with which you burn chaste' as lacking in passion, pointing not only to the sexual asceticism of *Olive* but also to Du Bellay's rhetorical parsimony and metric restraint. The rift between them could only deepen as their differences multiplied.

Du Bellay pointedly expanded his range by adding to *Olive* poems that reach beyond the Petrarchan mode. The first edition, for example, includes *L'Anterotique,* an octosyllabic spoof on Petrarchism. Its libidinous speaker fashions a parodic blazon in defiance of an old woman who schemes to estrange him from his young beloved: "Sans cesse je l'iroy' chantant" 'Without stopping I will go on singing about her" (166). In the *Vers lyriques* Du Bellay, much like the adversary in *L'Anterotique,* goads Ronsard to renounce his coterie fame: "Amy, tu es tel, / Que rien, qu'immortel, / Ne te pouroit plaire" 'Friend, you are such that nothing but immortal fame should please you' (4.115–20). In poem 10 he implies that Ronsard's growing acclaim can only diminish his own, "Puis que je n'ay beu, / Comme toy, de l'unde sacrée" 'Since I have not drunk like you from the sacred stream' (41–42). Already Du Bellay hints that Ronsard, despite his superior gifts, is not living up to his full poetic potential.

The second edition of *Olive* appends *La Musagnoeomachie,* a mock epic on the rout of Ignorance by the Muses. Defending the muses are Marot, Salel, Héroët, Saint-Gelais, Scève, Peletier, and Tyard, "qui en sonnez cantiques . . . / Font revivre les antiques" 'who in sonnets and songs . . . bring the ancients back to life' (213–15), but also "trois flambeaux, / De Phebus heureux augure" 'three luminaries, Apollo's fortunate augur' (253–54). Linked by a series of puns on the name of their teacher at the Collège de Coqueret, Jean Dorat, "qui dore / Ses vers, que Parnasse adore" 'who gilds their poetry which Parnassus adores' (260–61), these last three remain incognito. One may be Jean de Baif, whose

father Lazare de Baif precedes them. Another may be Du Bellay himself, reduced to an anonymous cipher. The third is Ronsard, figured as "le Pindare François" 'the French Pindar' (274). Awarded a stanza of hyperbolic praise, he is surely the strongest contender in the group and one to whom the author defers. But this deference only summons and defines the social and professional distance between them.

In other poems Du Bellay collapses this distance with expressions of antagonism against other poets and their patrons. "Contre les Petrarquistes" (published 1558), for example, is a satiric reworking of "A une Dame" (1553), composed while Ronsard was still working on *Les Amours*.[26] It criticizes the limited use that poets have made of Petrarchan figures, suggesting an economic motivation for peddling such Petrarchan "peintures vaines / Qui donnent plus de plaisir aux lisants" 'empty pictures that give more pleasure to readers' (60–61). The goal is to secure opulent patronage and prevent the rise of "quelque nouveau poète à la cour" 'whatever new poet at court' (81).[27] "Le Poète courtisan" (published in 1559) takes satiric aim less at writers deficient in their art than at a readership indifferent to high standards, "partout où l'ignorance est plus autorisée" 'wherever that ignorance is favorably authorized' (34). The best strategy for poets is to flatter ignorance and to avoid "de mots durs ou nouveaux qui puissent amuser / Tant soit peu le lisant" 'difficult or new words that could distract the reader in the least possible way' (75–77). True poets never lower the bar for excellence.

Although Ronsard had spent much of the previous decade writing Petrarchan lyrics for the cream of society, very rich and very thick, Du Bellay directed neither "Contre les Petrarquistes" nor "Le Poète courtisan" against him. *Aumônier* of the Dauphin's bride, Mary Stuart, Ronsard found favor and protection from the royal couple and later from Charles IX. As he adjusted his political vision to suit theirs, he became too valuable an asset to suffer his friend's criticism. Throughout the 1550s he experimented deftly with scores of verse forms as his Petrarchan sonnets, Horatian odes, and Pindaric hymns gave way to the *gaietés, mignardises, mascarades,* and panegyrics of the *Livret de Folestries* (April 1553), *Bocage* and *Meslanges* (November 1554), and the *Continuation des Amours* (August 1555). In the process Ronsard shaped and reshaped his identity as a preeminent court poet, executing his family romance with a grander cast of characters than those whom Du Bellay managed to assemble. As a correspondent with Du Bellay and a critic of his verse, Ronsard remained a sympathetic reader, willing coconspirator, and useful accomplice in his friend's project, but, when the occasion required, he would don different masks for

different purposes. Du Bellay continued to hone his identity as a spokesman for allegiances larger than himself, as an interlocutor for France and its evolving nationhood. In this mobile world he might haltingly address his friend as a Baudelairean "hypocrite lecteur,—mon semblable,—mon frère!" 'dissembling reader, my likeness, my brother!"

Nowhere does Du Bellay's perception of Ronsard's mercurial personality emerge more clearly than in *Les Regrets,* published on 17 January 1558, and nowhere does their conflicted relationship signal more clearly Du Bellay's aversion to what court life had become at Paris.[28] In it Du Bellay reverses the figure of placidity which Ronsard had assigned to him in sonnet 58 of *Les Amours.* There Du Bellay enjoys the quiet of his study, while Ronsard suffers the tumult of love. Here, with a Marotic wink at the irony of reversal, Du Bellay complains that he suffers the tumult of Rome while Ronsard enjoys the security of court at Paris. The volume's dedication to Seigneur Jean d'Avanson evokes a tangle of intrigues and alliances subtending the sequence. D'Avanson, Cardinal Jean du Bellay's rival and replacement as papal ambassador, incarnates the latter's disgrace at the hands of Carlo Carafa and the Guise faction upon the election of Pope Paul IV in May 1555, a disgrace stemming from his advocacy for peace with Spain chronicled in sonnet 49 of *Les Regrets.*[29] Du Bellay respects d'Avanson as the king's choice in Rome, itself now identified as a province of France, the colony that it once governed—"sur vostre doz deschargea sa grandeur / Pour la porter en estrange province" 'he puts his grandeur on your back to bring it to a foreign province'—but he clearly cannot warm up to the cardinal's successor.[30] The ambitions of successful poets such as Ronsard furnish a standard against which Du Bellay measures his own lack of success.

Self-described in sonnet 4 as one who is "agité d'une fureur plus basse" 'agitated by a lower sort of rage,' Du Bellay rejects any share in the elevated *furor poeticus* that Ronsard had claimed.[31] Despite his call to write "simplement," he packs his cycle with pointed allusions not just to Petrarch and other Italian writers but also to Horace as a model of Roman satire, to Ovid as a poet of exile, and finally to Marot as a French predecessor who suffered the sting of banishment which Ronsard never experienced.[32] Sonnet 25, "Malheureux l'an, le mois, le jour, l'heure, et le poinct" 'Unhappy the year, the month, the day, the hour, and the moment,' parodies Petrarch's sonnet 61, "Benedetto sia 'l giorno e 'l mese et l'anno" 'Blessed be the day and the month and the year,' transforming the latter's benedictory topos about love into a malediction about exile. Here his bumbling—"d'un sinistre presage, / Je me blessay le pied sortant

de ma maison" 'as a sinister warning I injured my foot as I left my house'—recalls Ovid's *Amores* 1.12.3–4, in which a servant stubs her toe after delivering an ominous message. The double allusion distances him further from Ronsard. Like Ovid in Tomis, Petrarch had thought himself an exile in France when he served the papacy at Avignon, and he felt at home only after returning to Italy. Du Bellay now considers himself an outcast in Rome and regrets his absence from France.

Du Bellay tallies the cost of this dislocation in linguistic currency.[33] Just as Petrarch sought to become known throughout Europe for his Latin poetry, so does Du Bellay, if only for lack of a French readership in Rome, as he complains in sonnet 10, "changeant à l'estranger mon naturel langage" 'exchanging my native language for a foreign one.' The poem answers sonnet 3 of Ronsard's *Continuation des Amours* (1555), "Ce pendant que tu vois le superbe rivage / . . . Et que l'air des Latins te fait parler latin" 'While you see the [Tiber's] proud shore, and the melody of the Latin people makes you speak Latin,' in which Ronsard's complaint rings hollow. On the Tiber's shores no one appreciates Du Bellay's fluency in the ancient language. His Neo-Latin elegy, "Patriae desiderium" 'His longing for his country,' written at Rome in 1556 and published in *Poemata,* accuses the Italians of butchering correct Latin, requiring him "alios ritus, aliosque ediscere mores, / Fingere, & insolito uerba aliena sono" 'to learn other customs and other manners, and to shape foreign words with sounds I am not used to' (17–18).[34] Here Du Bellay echoes Ovid's disclaimer that in exile "nec te mirari, si sint vitiosa decebit / carmina, quae faciam paene poeta Getes / . . . structaque sunt nostris barbara verba modis" 'you should not wonder if my verse prove faulty, for I am almost a Getic poet . . . setting barbarian words to our measures' (*Ex Ponto* 4.13.17–19), with the backhanded inversion that, while the Latin poet disdained the barbarian tongue of Tomis, the French poet bemoans the barbarian Latin of papal Rome.[35]

The predicament of *Les Regrets* enables Du Bellay to fathom what it means to be French. Looking from the outside at French culture allows him to perceive a shape, a form that it did not appear to have when viewed from within. Against the foreign customs and provincialisms that he experiences abroad, France might only seem the "mere des arts, des armes, et des bois" 'mother of the arts, of arms, and of forests' which Italy can no longer be (sonnet 9).[36] In sonnet 68 ("Je hay du Florentin l'usuriere avarice" 'I hate the Florentine's usurious avarice'), a catalog of temperaments found in Italy, England, Spain, and Germany, the speaker concludes "Bref, je hay quelque vice en chasque nation"

'In brief, I hate some vice in each nation,' even as he imputes treachery and indiscretion to his own compatriots, "le traistre Bourguignon, et l'indiscret François" 'the treacherous Burgundian and the indiscreet Frenchman' and, disparagingly imputes to himself "un Sçavoir pedantesque" 'a pedantic learning'.[37] Rome inevitably earns his harshest criticism because of its malign influence on all Christian nations, "tout ce qu'on void de bien et de mal en ce monde" 'everything that one sees good and bad in this world' (sonnet 78). Not only the corrupt clergy but also their illicit women ("ces vielles Alcines" 'these old Alcinas' [sonnet 90]) and their complete infamy ("quelque Cloaque immunde" 'some deep cesspool' [sonnet 109]) dishonor the city.

Leaving Italy, Du Bellay passes through Calvinist Geneva, whose Psalm-singing churchgoers exemplify sheer hypocrisy: "L'avarice et l'envie, / Et tout cela qui plus tourmente notre vie, / Domine en ce lieu-là plus qu'en tout autre lieu" 'Avarice and envy and all that wrecks the most havoc with our lives, dominate there more than anywhere else' (sonnet 136). The charges recall those of Petrarch's Babylonian sonnets against Avignon, the "nido di tradimenti in cui si cova / quanto mal per lo mondo oggi si spande" 'nest of treachery where is hatched whatever evil is spread through the world today' (sonnet 136, coincidentally the same number as Du Bellay's poem in *Les Regrets*). Petrarch's commentator Antonio Brucioli reaffirmed Avignon as a pit of depravity, "Ne credo che si potesse pure imaginare corte piu scelerata . . . tanto mi piano obrobriose" 'I do not believe that a more shameful court can even be imagined . . . so derogatory do [these sonnets] seem to me' (cxx^{r}). Du Bellay restores national dignity to France by transferring his invective from Petrarch's Avignon to contemporary Geneva and to the Calvinist reform that Henri II had outlawed. Upon his arrival in Paris and his reunion with Ronsard, he confidently declares the French capital "sans pairs" 'without peer,' however much he might contemn its "badaud populaire, / La presse des chartiers, le procès, et les fanges' 'common idler, the pamphleteers' press, the legal proceedings, the filth' (sonnet 138, with ironic parallels to Petrarch's same-numbered sonnet 138, "o fucina d'inganni, o pregion dira / ove 'l ben more e 'l mal si nutre et cria" 'o foundry of deceits, cruel prison where good dies and evil is created and nourished').

No sooner does Du Bellay settle back into life at the French court than he decries in sonnets 139–51 the vanity and mendacity that he finds there. In this context Ronsard emerges as both exempt from and yet implicated in the petty squabbles that poison the atmosphere. In sonnet 140 he protests to Ronsard that here "nous voyons bien souvent une longue amitié / Se changer pour un

rien en fière inimitié" 'we often see a long friendship turn to ferocious hatred over a trifle,' and in sonnet 145 he denounces "la feintise, / L'ignorance, l'envie, avec la convoitise" 'the deception, ignorance, envy, with covetousness' which prevail. In making these charges, Du Bellay comes full circle with respect to Ronsard's ambivalent success. Already at the beginning of *Les Regrets* Du Bellay had expressed his chagrin about preferment at court by comparing his fortunes to his friend's. In sonnet 8 Ronsard, "la moitié de mon ame" 'the half of my soul,' enjoys "la saincte faveur de ton Prince et du mien" 'the sacred trust of your prince and mine,' while in sonnet 17 Du Bellay suffers with other poets in Charon's lower depths: "En vain nous tendons les mains vers le Nautonnier sourd" 'In vain we extend our arms toward the deaf boatman.' Even in the afterlife depicted in sonnet 20, implying that the French court is a kind of hell, Ronsard manages to corner the market as a beatified Orpheus, "Le grand prestre de Thrace au long sourpely blanc" 'the great priest of Thrace in his long white robe,' while Du Bellay in sonnet 22 trails behind: "Je suivray, si je puis, / Les plus humbles chansons de ta Muse lassee" 'I will follow, if I can, the humblest songs of your exhausted muse.'

In these criticisms Du Bellay complains that Ronsard has squandered his superb formal talent on elegant trifles.[38] "Jamais ne voira-lon, que Ronsard amoureux?" 'Will we never see Ronsard in any mood other than amatory?' he laments in sonnet 23. Recalling his friends in sonnet 156, Du Bellay praises Belleau's pastorals and anacreontics, Peletier's didactic verse, Jodelle's drama, and Ronsard's *Franciade,* which thunders with "l'horrible effroy d'une estrange armonie" 'the horrific terror of a strange harmony.' And yet Ronsard delays his national epic while confecting amatory bonbons instead. In the hierarchy of genres proposed in sonnets 157–58, Du Bellay promises to memorialize his friend in "un palais magnifique à quatre appartemens" 'a magnificent palace with four apartments.' Here he situates the Greek, Latin, Italian, and French national poets in separate wings, lending each a distinctive architectural style: "L'appartement premier Homere aura pour marque, / Virgile le second, le troisieme Petrarque, / Du surnom de Ronsard le quatrieme on dira" 'The first apartment will have Homer for its standard, Virgil the second, the third Petrarch, and one will designate the fourth with the name of Ronsard.' Partly to incite Ronsard to complete his epic but also partly to criticize him for biding time, this grouping puts Ronsard's talent on the defensive. Like Petrarch, who abandoned his epic *Africa* in frustration, Ronsard does not finish his epic *Franciade.* But then Du Bellay himself appears close to forsaking his own poetic ambitions.

Les Regrets ends with a sober intimation of this possibility. In sonnet 189, addressed to Peletier, Du Bellay evokes a change of direction: "Je voulois, comme toy, les vers abandonner / Pour à plus hault labeur plus sage m'addonner" 'Like you, I would like to abandon my poetry in order to give myself to a wiser, more elevated sort of task.' Concurrently, he would offer translation from Greek poetry to supplement Louis Le Roy's translation of Plato's *Symposium* (published in November 1558); he would produce a French translation of book 6 of Virgil's *Aeneid* (published in February 1560); and he would compose a *Discours sur le sacre du très chrétien Roi François II* (begun upon the death of Henri II in July 1559 and published posthumously, in March 1560) and an *Ample discours au roi sur le fait des quatre états du royaume de France* (published in 1567). Here, and in sharp contrast with Ronsard at this juncture, Du Bellay envisions a selfless turn toward public service. It is as though on the last verge of a sad and wasteful fraternal rivalry he were ceding poetic preeminence to Ronsard before moving on to other forms of writing and public ministration.

What provoked this change of direction? The final sonnets of *Les Regrets* eulogize two women close to the heartbeat of French power, suggesting the poet's bid for patronage from them. They are Mary Stuart, the bride of the Dauphin François II, whom Ronsard served as *aumônier* (sonnet 170), and Marguerite de France, Henry II's sister and the future wife of Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy (sonnets 174–90).[39] Here Du Bellay repeats the virtues of Petrarch's Laura as figures of national ascendance. With Mary Stuart he forecasts "qu'on revoie encore le beau siècle doré" 'that one might see yet again the beautiful golden century." With Marguerite, however, the future appears less assured, as he perceives a decline among the arts and sciences. In sonnet 190 Du Bellay hopes that she will resume her patronage as a Pallas Athena of France:

> Phoebus s'en fuit de nous, et l'antique ignorance
> Sous la faveur de Mars retourne encore en France,
> Si Pallas ne defend les lettres et les arts.

Phoebus takes flight from us and the ancient ignorance returns to France under the patronage of Mars, unless Pallas defends our arts and letters.

With this somber vision of an uncertain future Du Bellay ends *Les Regrets*.[40] The differences between Ronsard and himself turn on these figures. Mary Stuart, the king's daughter-in-law and a soon-to-be queen to whom Ronsard enjoys close access, represents youth, ease, the promise of the future; Marguerite, the king's sister, whose occasional attention Du Bellay has received, represents

grace, intelligence, but also an awareness of political conflicts ravaging the present. The relationships of Ronsard and Du Bellay with these women represent the polarities of public response in sixteenth-century France. Ronsard saw his status as an opportunity for a display of wit and luxuriant language, a site of self-indulgence at the expense of grander poetic ambitions. Du Bellay saw his as an opportunity for service to the nation, a site of cultural awareness, even if he lacked the opportunity and resources to carry out his intent more boldly.

What, then, did Ronsard represent for Du Bellay? A touch of rivalry and even envy defines Du Bellay's attitude toward his friend but also a sense of regret for the latter's wasted talent. Ronsard's lassitude infuriated Du Bellay. The exchange between them developed friction as Ronsard's success nudged Du Bellay to reflect from abroad upon the pretensions of social distinctions in France. Although Du Bellay had initially addressed a literate, well-to-do, but narrowly defined class of readers, he eventually embraced a more inclusive national population. As *Deffence* 2.11 shows when it commends the language of "not only the learned, but also all kinds of workmen and mechanics" (172/95), the public, interwoven, heteroglossic nature of French society fascinated him. Not so for Ronsard. The latter withdrew from all that he saw melting into the great national mass, and he located his energies entirely within an elite culture that he linked to the monarchy and a compliant nobility. Like Du Bellay, he sought to harmonize classical, foreign, and familiar forms in the name of a French cultural genius, but, unlike Du Bellay, he associated this harmony with a courtly style that could only alienate and exclude popular, coarse-grained, or socially marginal elements. It was as though the goal of the *Deffence* to distinguish patrician from pedestrian through an enriched classical and vernacular education had consumed itself. Instead of directing this education to the service of the nation and state, Ronsard had applied it to his personal advancement.

Du Bellay was forgiving up to a point—by 1552 he had even reconciled with Thomas Sebillet, by then a member of the Parisian Parlement who had provided two dedicatory poems for Du Bellay's *Oeuvres de invention* in that year and to whom he would warmly address sonnet 122 of *Les Regrets.* But he remained skeptical about limits that Ronsard had imposed on the national imaginary. Whereas the latter seemed content, at least in 1550, to bask in the honors that a literary reputation could bring, Du Bellay pressed further to regenerate an expansive idea of nation and *patrie.* His active dialogue, it is true, took place wholly among the members of a stratified nobility who sought to reaffirm their own social and cultural prestige at a time of rapid change. But

what had begun as an effort to certify the fitness of the untitled nobility for diplomatic service turned into a program soon to be emulated on a broader scale by the urban elite, various professional classes, and all who aspired to higher station in life. Ronsard might have sought its rewards for his personal profit, but Du Bellay more soberly apprehended its supraregional, translocal effects. At this point loyalties to individual people and allegiances to households, associates, patrons, and kin fired his creative imagination and energized his patriotic identification with a larger whole.

This page intentionally left blank

8 *Courtly and Anti-Courtly Sidneian Identities*

The last major Petrarchan sonnet sequence in English, Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,* appeared in print with the author's prose romance, *The Countesse of Montgomeries Urania.* The date of its publication was 1621 (Stationers' Register, 13 July), a year of political catastrophe for James I and of crisis in the formation of English ideas about nation, state, and political liberty. Nearly a century earlier Henry VIII's Act of Appeals (1533) had proclaimed that "this realme of Englond is an Impire," a sovereign community beholden to the authority of no foreign ruler, including the pope.[1] The trajectory of English literary history from Henry's proclamation of England's sovereignty to the publication of Wroth's sonnets abounds in English national sentiment. The development of the sonnet form from Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* (composed 1581–82?), whose pirated publication in 1591 ignited a literary fad, to Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* a long generation later bears traces of sometimes conflicting, sometimes converging ideas about this sentiment.[2] It is one that relativizes the differences of national status, rank, privilege, and prestige among various classes in England in a fictional construction attuned to the extraordinary social mobility of the period.

Mary Wroth (1586/87–1651/53) participates in this process as the offspring of a prominent family.[3] The niece of Philip Sidney (1554–86) and of Mary Sidney (1561–1621) and the daughter of Robert Sidney (1563–1626), she engaged in forms of literary activity already practiced by her uncle, aunt, and father as well as by her cousin, Mary's son, William Herbert (1580–1630).[4] All five members of this high-ranking family composed poetry in the Petrarchan mode.

Philip Sidney, Robert Sidney, and Mary Wroth wrote sonnet sequences, and William Herbert tried his hand at odes. Mary Sidney translated Petrarch's *Triumph of Death* into English blank verse (1590). Each brought to the task a commitment to develop a specifically English literary style with a specifically English sense of cultural identity.[5]

This identity was strongly Protestant. Philip Sidney reached maturity in the late 1570s at a time when Queen Elizabeth appeared disposed to marry the French king's younger brother, the Catholic duke of Anjou. Fearing that this match would lead to a policy of French appeasement and papal despotism, a group of Protestant nobles clustered around the earl of Leicester voiced its opposition. Finding an eloquent spokesman in Philip Sidney, the group also decried the temporizing strategies of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Burghley on matters of international policy in the early 1580s.[6] For his role in this matter Sidney suffered the queen's scorn and a period of ostracism from court, during which he wrote much of his literary work at his sister's estate in Wilton. The term *radical Protestant* associated with Sidney's faction (whose members included Walsingham, the earl of Pembroke, Sir Francis Knollys, and the earl of Bedford) bears scant reference to its doctrinal beliefs, for they ranged from a pious endorsement of Queen Elizabeth's pragmatic via media to a qualified embrace of severe Calvinist teaching. It refers instead to the group's commitment to a foreign policy shaped in accord with the religious divisions of Europe, in the conviction that England's political interests would best be served by helping the international Protestant rebellion against the Catholic powers of Spain, France, and the papacy.[7] After Philip's death in 1586, Mary Sidney assumed a cultural leadership for the cause by publishing his belletristic writing, by sponsoring projects modeled upon it, by finishing his translation of Psalms (1585? completed by her and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in 1599), and by offering her own translation of Philippe Duplessis-Mornay's *Discourse of Life and Death* (1592; complementing Philip's unfinished translation of Mornay's *Trewnesse of the Christian Religion,* 1585, completed by Arthur Golding in 1587).[8]

The concept of nation, state, and liberty inscribed in the Sidneys' work affirms the legitimacy of monarchical power, the effectiveness of an oppositional strategy dominated by the titled nobility, and the practical agency of the English people as an entity opposed to the powers of Catholic Europe. In the poetry of Philip and Mary Sidney and their niece Mary Wroth, these associations crisscross in patterns to which Petrarchan forms of thought lend striking emphasis. The romance narratives of Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia* (written in 1577–80), his incomplete *New Arcadia* (1584? published by Fulke Greville in

1590), the fused new and old versions in *The Countess of Pembrokes Arcadia,* published by Mary Sidney in 1593, and Mary Wroth's *The Countess of Montgomeries Urania* reflect the heroism of this cause in the public realm.[9] The sonnets of *Astrophil and Stella* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* reflect its conscious dynamics in more intimate matters in which sons strive to attain what their fathers could not achieve and nieces apologize for their uncles within the curious frame of Petrarchan sonnets.

A striking feature of these sonnets is that their amatory entanglements reflect historical tensions and cultural conflicts in the emerging national sentiment, even though their literary pedigree is predominantly foreign, issuing from the Continental matrix of Italy, France, Spain, and the papacy which Protestant England sought to define itself against.[10] This contrast is odd. At a time when England's elite was asserting the nation's own religious and political sovereignty, its literary avant-garde turned to models of Petrarchism and other cultural forms associated with the decadence, corruption, and depravity of Catholic Europe. The peculiar fact that most Elizabethan sonneteers, including the Sidneys, were Protestants with occasionally pronounced Calvinist leanings implies a strain in their cultivation of aristocratic pastimes and pleasures imported from abroad.[11] Their preferences provide a stunning example for Freud's claim that in cultural life the totemic dead father becomes "stronger than the living one had been" (13.143). Having vanquished an older order by denouncing papal authority and destroying its vestiges in England, the new order takes upon itself the task of reconstituting the former's vestiges in a now changed social and political environment.[12] The principal players gesture toward the totemic failure to recover something perceived as genuinely lost.[13]

The high cultural sophistication of Continental literary and artistic forms proved more socially and psychologically attractive than the austerity of nascent puritanism. Addressing its administrative needs, the formative nation-state had long looked to the Continent for powerful examples of bureaucratic institutions and stratagems of statecraft as it built a professionally organized civil service.[14] Addressing its social and cultural needs, it shadowed the Petrarchan projects of Bembo in Italy, Boscán in Spain, and Du Bellay in France as it codified and consolidated its own linguistic resources.[15] Each of those writers sought to regularize forms of poetic language which might shape a national cultural identity. In *A Defence of Poetry* Philip Sidney sought the same for England.

Although Sidney's *Defence* accords less attention to literary language than do Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* or Du Bellay's *Deffence et illustration,* it defines a more pungent relationship between language and national character

than either. *A Defence* notes that England appears a unified nation with regard to its insular boundaries (though not its contested borders with Scotland or Wales) but that its linguistic forms and ethnic composition are remarkably mixed. Renaissance humanist philology had outlined the linguistic structure of English from a diversity of national origins, taking pride in the mobility, flexibility, and adaptability that enabled Celts and Romans, Angles and Saxons, Danes and Normans, to interact, no matter how bloody their rivalries might have been.[16] Sidney's *Defence* boldly foregrounds the Tudor version of history which attributes temporal and ethnic primacy to the Cymric or Brittanic Celts, "the true remnant of the ancient Britons" driven westward to Cornwall—the ancestral seat of the Sidneys as well as of the Tudors—"through all the conquests of Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Norman, some of whom did seek to ruin all memory of learning from among them" (76).[17] Its argument appeals to both the ancient and contemporary resources of a language, a history, and a people imagined as conduits toward an awaited future.

In Sidney's narrative wave after wave of immigration produces a rich and varied language whose mixed forms are still growing, still unsettled, and still attesting to cultural contradictions inside the nation's borders.[18] Contemporaneous dialects of the North, the South and Southwest, the East Midlands, and Kent recall the territorial divisions of successive settlements by Vikings, Saxons, Frisians, Anglians, and Jutes, as each left its mark on the English vernacular. Both product and sign of ancient historical struggle, these dialects resisted assimilation into a monolithic cultural unity. Such humanists as Roger Asham and John Cheke had labored to imagine the integrity of the language as a fact, as when Cheke professed in 1561 that "our own tung shold be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangeled with borrowing of other tunges."[19] But, no matter how much religious, political, and economic unity these teachers had wished for, they could not offset the relative autonomy of regional, class, or professional divisions inscribed in the nation's dialects.

This mixture and diversity drew Sidney's attention in *A Defence.* He recognizes a long-standing bifurcation in the class structure of England's culture. It occurs most dramatically in Chaucer, the poet of an unruly London vernacular spoken by commoners with varying degrees of cultivation, as distinct from an increasingly exclusive Norman French spoken by the elite, "of whom, truly, I know not whether to marvel more, either that he in that misty time could see so clearly, or that we in this clear age go so stumblingly after him" (112).[20] One literary source for this understanding might have been the preface to William Thynne's printed edition of Chaucer in 1532. Signed by Brian Tuke, a

London schoolmaster, it sketches the descent of English from ancient Latin through a contamination of sixth-century Germanic Anglican, Saxon, Frisian, and Jute vernaculars and eleventh-century Franco-Norman. Just as French had stemmed from Latin, so in Tuke's imagination had the Germanic languages, adducing Latin and its "parent" Greek as their ultimate roots and the unifying elements of English: "Of trouthe (whiche some shall scarsely beleue) the Germayns haue so fourmed the order of their langage . . . [in] as nere concordaunce to the phrase of the latyn as the French tong hath."[21] Chaucer, according to Tuke, exploited the Latin origins of an aristocratic French patois and a predominantly Germanic middle-class vernacular. His "English" compromise nonetheless strikes Sidney as leaving some "great wants, fit to be forgiven in so reverent an antiquity" (112), a charge that Chaucer himself anticipated as owing to "so gret diversite / In Englissh and in writyng of oure tonge" (*Troilus and Criseyde* 5.1793–95).[22] A related criticism about the artifice of Chaucer's compromise motivates Thomas Wilson's allegation in *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553) that the contemporary "fine courtier will talk nothing but Chaucer."[23] Whether accurate or not, Wilson's claim registers a perception (and an invidious sense of exclusion) which, perhaps owing to Thynne's publication, Chaucerian affectations were used to reinforce social differences among the elite at Whitehall.[24]

By 1589 George Puttenham had confidently declared as standard "the usuall speach of the Court, and that of London and the shires lying about London within lx. myles, and not much above," a radius that includes Oxford, Cambridge, Sussex, and Kent.[25] This speech distinguishes the area from less prosperous or influential regions to the south and north. Situated at the geographical conjunction of the Saxon and Frisian dialects in the South, the Anglian dialect in East Midland, and Jutish remnants in Kent dialects, London absorbs a mixed language with a predominance of Anglian forms. Its complex social structure also nurtures a potential for betraying subtle class differences among those with street-wise inflections, foreign or regional accents, and punctilious grammar or hypercorrect pronunciation.[26] As the seat of court and the state bureaucracy and the focus of commercial and economic interchange, London attracted visitors, immigrants, and relocated workers whose linguistic forms reproduced the major divisions in that society as they entered into mainstream discourse.

Nor did educational opportunities necessarily level out these differences. In his treatise *Elementarie* (1582) Richard Mulcaster, Edmund Spenser's former teacher as headmaster of the Merchant Tailors' School, had urged a populist

expansion of literacy with an enriched vocabulary drawn from Anglicized borrowings of Continental words: "Theie proue the nations exercise in learning, and their practis in other dealings: so theie seme to infer no base witted people . . . bycause it is not for foulls to be so well learned."[27] He specifically opposed word formations on the analogy of classical Latin, however, since the latter recalls papal or imperial domination, "the *Latin* tung remembring vs, of our thraldom & bondage," whence his celebrated peroration: "I honor the *Latin,* but I worship the *English*" (269). Although Mulcaster's pioneering program of elementary education for all, female as well as male, proved ultimately unrealizable in his time, it still envisioned the benefits of drawing the nation together through a common speech variegated with local color.[28]

Sidney shared Mulcaster's sentiment about a polymorphic, polychromatic English that reflects the nation's diversity, but he paid no tribute to its demotic origins. His generation routinely associated elements of Frisian and Old Saxon in the southern and western dialects with Cade's Sussex rebellion, Welsh insurgency, and the fifteenth-century barons' revolt.[29] Writers such as George Gascoigne and Thomas Nashe allowed remnants of Viking, Gaelic, and Old Saxon in the northern dialects for "poeticall licence" and to "drawe attentive reading."[30] In *A Defence* even Sidney admits his embarrassment at thrilling to the martial strains of an old Scottish border ballad about Percy and Douglas despite its "rude style," but he stiffly repudiates Northumbrian archaisms in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender,* with such substitutions as *a* for *o* (e.g., *ane* for *one*), *u* for *o* (e.g., *gud* for *good*), and *u* for *l* (e.g., *fauce* for *false*) which imply "an old rustic language I dare not allow."[31]

Aside from a single experiment with such archaisms in the third eclogues of the *Old Arcadia,* the allegorical "As I my little flock on Ister Bank" that recounts the political philosophy of the Huguenot statesman Hubert Languet, Sidney grounds his style wholly in the courtly vernacular of Whitehall.[32] Such a vernacular proves apt for "any excellent exercising" of style because it is "a mingled language" that draws aggressively upon "the best" of its Franco-Norman and Anglo-Saxon origins. Its compound word formations "near the Greek, far beyond the Latin" compare favorably with those in the father tongues of patriarchal culture, medicine and law, and the educational system that prepares boys for the world of commerce and bureaucracy (119). And in "sweetness" and "majesty" its poetry compares more than favorably with the Italian, French, Spanish, and Dutch verse that Sidney encountered in diplomatic service.[33] As tokens of the author's foreign travel, souvenirs of his public activity, these literary remnants of "vulgar languages" abroad had little im-

pact upon his day-to-day uses of English at home. In compensation, however, a pursuit of English verse and the "noble name of learning" allowed Sidney to fantasize his social distinction through the exercise of art: "Thus doing, though you be *libertino patre natus,* you shall suddenly grow *Herculea proles*" (120–21). The Latin quotations, proof of the writer's education and signs of his bid for elevation in rank, effectively convey his position as the son of an untitled father ("libertino patre natus" 'born of a freeman father,' from Horace's *Epodes* [1.20.20] and *Satires* [1.6.6, 45–46]) who craves the distinction of higher lineage (to be or become a "Herculea proles" 'descendant of Hercules,' from Ovid's *Fasti* [2.237]). The Leicester faction that Sidney so dutifully serves reflects his maternal descent, the inheritance of his Dudley ancestry. As I will argue in chapter 11, the *liberty* that he entreats would proclaim his right to bequeath a would-be title to posterity.

To reclaim his lost authority, Sidney mobilizes the power of language. Acknowledging that English is culturally belated, he makes a virtue of its hybrid Germanic and Romance roots, "so much the better, taking the best of both the other" (119). He also makes a virtue of its dialectical capacities to dominate other linguistic forms. English, for example, may be imposed upon the speech of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales while absorbing revenue from the latter. In his *Discourse on Irish Affairs* (1577) Sidney anticipates Edmund Spenser's argument in *A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* (1596) that the English monarchy could subdue Ireland by setting the grid of its language upon "their manner of life wherein they choose rather all filthiness, than any law."[34] On similar grounds James I, in "An Schort Treatise Concerning Some Reulis and Cautelis to Observit and Eschewit in Scotis Poesie" (1584), urges the Scots to assimilate to their language a more prestigious English idiom from London.[35] In *A Defence* Sidney deems the most valuable feature of this language its grammatical transparency, its apparent freedom from inflectional restraints: "For grammar it might have, but it needs it not, being so easy in itself, and so void of those cumbersome differences of cases, genders, moods, and tenses which I think was a piece of the Tower of Babylon's curse" (119). In his view its syntactical self-evidence makes English a perfect vehicle for clarity and persuasion, a political instrument to tame and conquer the unruly passions of persons and of nations.[36] He neglects to mention that his argument may also lead to the opposite conclusion. The presumptive self-evidence and lack of inflectional cues in English can also unleash ambiguity and confusion, an emptying of grammatical relations as in Astrophil's (and later Pamphilia's) puzzling equivocations.

Such a language in fact typifies the aggregated give-and-take of a busy, pros-

perous London society that Sidney disdained. In *A Defence* he scorns its popular poetry forged by "base men with servile wits . . . who think it enough if they can be rewarded of the printer" (111) and its theater (admittedly ca. 1580–81, just before the efflorescence of Elizabethan drama and likely referring to amateur performances at Inns of Court), in which tragedy observes the rules "neither of honest civility nor skilful poetry" (112) and comedy of "nothing but scurrility" (115). He promotes instead a model of courtly eloquence in which even "smally learned courtiers" beget "a more sound style" than professional scholars or base commoners (118). His comments express the conviction that a professional managerial class recruited chiefly from the nobility and working with the Crown at court offers England's best hope for national consolidation and the betterment of the commonwealth. The social, cultural, political, and historical influence of bourgeois London on the rest of England could only afford an antithetical standard to which court and Crown would provide a visionary and more refined alternative.

Still, Sidney cannot deny that as a microcosm of England, London connects the whole in an evolving network of social, cultural political, economic, and linguistic relationships.[37] In the nation's originary myth it was the site of Troynovant (New Troy) where Aeneas' great-grandson, Brut, founded the capital of his eponymous Britain.[38] The sixteenth-century city in turn became a primary vehicle of nationhood as a center of commerce and culture where craft and trade companies played important roles in socializing their members to be or become better citizens.[39] Such companies provided three-quarters of adult males in the city with citizenship rights and a limited political voice, and their structured organization, next to that of families, afforded a model for close personal loyalty and embryonic national identity.[40] By regulating apprenticeships, they taught young men the skills of a craft or trade and, most important for national cohesion, the skills of literacy, training them to become workers, company men, heads of productive households, citizens, Londoners, and Englishmen. By providing constabularies, they played a regulatory political role in resolving craft and trade conflicts, recovering debts, and handling a wide variety of civil disputes so as to promote order throughout the realm.[41] They even played a role in developing the vernacular by offering membership to aliens and émigrés who could demonstrate competence in English and buy a license of denizenship to become naturalized citizens.[42] But all this goes unremarked in the Sidneys' literary endeavors.

The writings of Philip, Mary, and Robert Sidney, William Herbert, and Mary Wroth instead express an idealized vision of the nation which totemizes

noble families and their allegiance to aristocratic values.[43] Philip showed the way by acting out his romance version of Petrarchan courtiership, frustrated though he was by being stranded in the lesser nobility without earned title.[44] He either immersed himself in courtly ventures as a spokesman for forward-looking internationalist Protestants, or he detached himself in splendid isolation as a critic of the self-aggrandizement and inadequacies of court life.[45] Mary Sidney, countess of Pembroke, attained noble rank through her marriage to Henry Herbert, and, by publishing her brother's literary work in 1598, she strengthened the legacy of his commitment to courtly values.[46] Her "little court" at Wilton, already in Philip's lifetime a cultural alternative to Whitehall, continued to function through the early Stuart period as a site of oppositional patronage dedicated to his program.[47] Mary's son William Herbert became the third earl of Pembroke in 1601, and through his role as lord chamberlain and his patronage in the House of Commons he exerted some effect on national policy.[48] Philip and Mary's brother Robert received the baronage of Penshurst from James I in 1608 and the title of first earl of Leicester in 1618, honors for which his poetry, written in the 1590s, may express a covetous desire. Finally, his daughter, Lady Mary Wroth, married to one of the king's favored hunting companions, Sir Robert Wroth, upheld her claim to nobility and her identification with the Sidney lineage, despite economic hardship after her husband's death in 1614 and despite the censoring of her prose romance *Urania* upon its publication.[49] Because of the family's often renegade status with respect to the monarchy and the court aristocracy, its collective writings across four decades from the completion of *Astrophil and Stella* to the publication of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* offer an unusual perspective from which to assess the permeable borders of social status and national identity in early modern England.

Sidney's and Wroth's Petrarchan sequences reveal their family's preoccupation with the moral attributes of elite leadership and consequently with the process of defining a national character resulting from that leadership. Both sequences focus on the affective lives of their high-born speakers, and both call for an astute readership capable of making fine moral distinctions and drawing apt critical conclusions about what it has read. Full of high promise to defend the nation and to protect it from its enemies, Astrophil allows his infatuation for Stella to sink his stock, "And by just counts my selfe a banckrout know / Of all those goods, which heav'n to me have lent" (sonnet 18). He is a would-be courtier whose "great expectation" collapses in a "trail of shame" (sonnet 21). Pamphilia becomes queen of Morea, and her beloved becomes king of Naples, king of the Romans, and Holy Roman Emperor, but their love

remains unresolved while they lead their respective kingdoms.[50] Against Sidney's negative representation of Astrophil's irresponsible behavior, Wroth's positive representation of Pamphilia's forbearance exemplifies royal virtue. The difference has nothing to do with any essentialized gender differences between Astrophil's masculine defiance and Pamphilia's feminine compliance.[51] It rather involves a status-inflected devotion to higher causes which marks the lover's and beloved's roles in Wroth's romance as monarchs of their respective nations.[52]

Pamphilia to Amphilanthus constitutes a poetic supplement to Wroth's prose narrative, and it begs to be read at least partly in the latter's narrative context.[53] There, at a plausible point of its partial insertion into the story, Pamphilia grants Amphilanthus's request for some verses: "She that was the discreetest fashioned woman, would not deny so small a favor . . . yet blushing told him, she was ashamed, so much of her folly should present her selfe unto his eyes."[54] Amphilanthus assures her not only of the "excellencies" of her verse but of "her excelling virtues" as well (First Part 320). Pamphilia's name means "a lover of all variety," not in any promiscuous sense but in reference to her superior *caritas* (First Part 300), and she unites qualities associated with exemplars of virginal chastity and attractive sexuality.[55] Destined to marry and beget a royal heir, she awaits a spouse who must live up to her ideals. A paragon of moral autonomy, she exposes by contrast the weakness of the man she loves. Amphilanthus's name means "the lover of two," a wicked understatement in view of his multiple amatory conquests over Antissa, Musalina, Lucenia, and finally the princess of Slavonia, whom he marries in the unfinished manuscript. His mishaps with Pamphilia, however, are not all willful. Military action dictates his absence, and kingly duty requires his espousal to a foreign princess for the good of his people.[56] Amphilanthus is at least loyal to his royal title.

Urania serves as a commentary on Philip Sidney's unfinished pastoral romance *Arcadia.* Its titular character evokes a shadowy figure with the same name in the *Old Arcadia,* a maiden "thought a shepherd's daughter, but indeed of far greater birth" (284–85).[57] In book 1, chapter 1, of the *New Arcadia* she is associated with the celestial Venus.[58] The Urania of Wroth's romance plays a less exalted role, in which she sometimes compromises her high ideals through necessity. Secondary to the action of Pamphilia and Amphilanthus, she serves as the former's confidante and is discovered to be her long lost sister.[59] In response to Pamphilia's predicament, she urges the heroine to relinquish severe constancy in favor of expedience:

> Tis pittie said *Vrania,* that euer that fruitlesse thing Constancy was taught you as a vertue, since for vertues sake you will loue it, as hauing true possession of your soule, but vnderstand, this vertue hath limits to hold it in, being a vertue, but thus that it is a vice in them that breake it, but those with whom it is broken, are by the breach free to leaue or choose againe where more staidnes may be found. (First Part 400)

Pamphilia recoils from this advice. Urania's practical counsel leavens Pamphilia's austerity without compromising her fidelity. She abnegates her feelings in order to serve the nation that she rules, even as Amphilanthus serves the nation that he rules.[60] In the Second Part of the fiction Urania herself concedes her admiration of Pamphilia, "the worlds glory, the honer earthe had for worthe and constancie" (Second Part 140).

Wroth's fusion of realism with idealism in her heroine's personal and political governance thus contrasts with the misdirected idealism of Sidney's egotistical speakers in *Astrophil and Stella* and *Arcadia.* Certainly Pamphilia's sober assessment of her amatory situation and her queenly duty represents the obverse of Astrophil's erotic infatuation, and it confers a moral focus upon the world of Astrophil's Petrarchan desires. It performs, that is, an exegetical function like that of the commentaries on Petrarch's poetry which attempt to define the lover's social, cultural, moral, and political situation. In this context *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* corrects *Astrophil and Stella* in the name of virtue. Both sequences participate in a discourse on sexual love which intersects with public concerns. Just as commentaries on the *Rime sparse* show that the poetic speaker's obsessions bear public consequences in the social, cultural, political, and economic orders, so Wroth's commentary upon her uncle's poetry shows that his speaker's obsessions have an impact on the world around him.

Astrophil distances himself from the attitudes and assumptions of his peers even while he indulges in their worst behaviors. Being both courtly and anticourtly, he is simultaneously Petrarchan and anti-Petrarchan, and in these respects he functions as a spokesman for his author, who could as well identify with his persona as stand apart from it. The sequence offers *Dichtung* with a basis in *Wahrheit.* Certainly, Sidney's coterie readers might draw fleet, funny, and politically pungent conclusions about the antic overlap between character and creator.[61] This intimacy matters in our assessment of the poetry. It shows that the author has enough wit and analytical detachment to expose his own shortcomings and hold them up to self-correction. Both pro and con, Sidney is a critic of the very system to which he belongs as an insider. Convinced that the nobility should assist the Crown in courtly rule, he nonetheless criticizes

its self-indulgent factionalism. Likewise pro and con, Sidney is a critic of the very Petrarchan poetry that he so brilliantly executes. Convinced that its refined diction and elegant style can serve as models to facilitate and improve public discourse, he nonetheless reproves its voluptuous luxuriance. *Astrophil and Stella* inscribes and encodes for its elite readership a conflict between Protestant individualism valued as a moral imperative and the corporate allegiances required by the emerging nation-state.

Sonnet 71 of *Astrophil and Stella* exemplifies these demands. With its direct echo of Petrarch's sonnet 248, "Chi vuol veder quantunque pò Natura" 'Whoever wishes to see how much Nature,' it inverts and deflates the latter's argument with a new moral and ideological turn. Its opening lines designate a readership with moral responsibility:

> Who will in fairest booke of Nature know,
> How Vertue may best lodg'd in beautie be,
> Let him but learne of *Love* to reade in thee
> *Stella,* those faire lines, which true goodnesse show.

As we have seen in chapters 5, 6, and 7, Italian commentators such as Vellutello and French translators and imitators such as Marot, Tyard, Ronsard, and Du Bellay had responded to Petrarch's sonnet as a self-reflexive statement of the writer's purpose. Sidney's poem takes a contrastive approach by emphasizing the reader's response "in fairest booke of Nature." Astrophil designates his audience as those who are receptive to certain aristocratic forms of "Vertue" and "beautie," and he sets out to improve their receptivity to a certain manner of interpreting words in relation to these forms, "to reade in thee / *Stella,* those faire lines, which true goodnesse show." He advocates, that is, not just a style of writing for the courtly elite but also a style of reading useful to its leadership. Appealing to readers drawn from titled ranks of the nobility as well as from untitled sectors of the bureaucratic and professional class, he would challenge them to share his vision and will and a sense of corporate identity if not national purposiveness. The ability to read and to write in more sophisticated ways would provide a foundation for active leadership by this elite. Hermeneutic skill and expressive dexterity constitute the prerequisites.

Unfortunately, Astrophil fails the test. In the second quatrain he presents Stella as an ideal worthy of emulation:

> There shall he find all vices overthrow,
> Not by rude force, but sweetest soveraigntie
> Of reason, from whose light those night-birds flie.

In the sestet he asserts that she plays this role consciously, not as a passive object of admiration but as an active agent that "does strive all minds to move." Her impact on him, however, disproves these very claims and diminishes his credibility: "But ah, Desire still cries, give me some food." The infatuated lover only profanes the ideal as he directs it toward his carnal satisfaction. As usual, Astrophil manages to miss the larger point of his own argument.[62]

Understood from this perspective, Sidney's poem evokes a strain of criticism pursued by earlier commentaries on the *Rime sparse.* In discussing Petrarch's sonnet 248, Gesualdo points to the moral flaws of an all too frail, all too human lover such as Petrarch. In the penultimate lines, "allor dirà che mie rime son mute, / l'ingegno offeso dal soverchio lume" 'then he will say that my rhymes are mute, my wit overcome by the excess of light,' he compares Petrarch to "augelli notturni, la cui uista è tanto offesa dal chiaro splendore del sole, ch'elli non possono d'altro tempo, che di notte uolare" 'nightbirds whose eyesight is so assaulted by the bright splendor of the sun that they can fly at no other time but night' (CCXCIIII^{r}). The speaker of Sidney's poem veers in this direction when he figures reason as an "inward" sun "from whose light those nightbirds flie," unwittingly correlating himself with those birds in the final line, "give me some food."[63] The aviary figure, absent from Petrarch but echoing from Gesualdo's gloss, suggests that Sidney, like Gesualdo, is exposing the speaker's folly. Astrophil sinks under the weight of his incomprehension. The Italian commentator emphasizes Petrarch's careful coupling of Laura's spiritual and temporal excellence, "NATVRA quanto alle cose humane, & il CIELO quanto alle cose celesti diuine" 'nature in relation to human concerns and heaven in relation to divine concerns,' and his condemnation of the observer "che non discerne il buono dal reo" 'who does not distinguish good from bad' (CCXCIIII^{r}). But these are associations that Astrophil does not make when he cries for hedonistic nourishment. He belongs entirely to Petrarch's "mondo cieco" 'blind world.'

Astrophil has seriously misread Petrarch. Even the poem's formal effects display his misreading and summon the bystander to critical judgment. In the octave, for example, the meter shifts almost imperceptibly from iambic to trochaic and requires the reader's mental adjustment just at the point at which Astrophil challenges his listeners to "reade" Stella as a text—"Lét him but leárne of *Lóve* to reáde in thée / *Stélla,* those fáire lines, which trúe goódnesse shów"—and again when Astrophil speaks of "all víces óverthrów, / Nót by rúde fórce, but swéetest sóveraigntie." In the sestet Astrophil's verse limps from offrhymes in *move/love* and "*good/food.*[64] Although it is true that we can never ex-

actly know Elizabethan pronunciation, the orthography of *flie* in line 7 evokes *fly* (concurring with Gesualdo's *uolare*) as another off-rhyme and visual pun that clashes with the sound of *flee* specified by *soveraignty.* Under the spell of its forward rhythm some readers—perhaps most—might apprehend the text visually as one set of signs while hearing or understanding it as quite another. For these readers the text could profit from some helpful commentary.

Still, Astrophil spurns the very idea of such commentary. He scoffs at those who "with allegories curious frame, / Of others children changlings use to make," associating their criticism with foreign intervention: "The raines of *Love* I love, though never slake, / And joy therein, though Nations count it shame" (sonnet 28). Against those who would cite his Petrarchan echoes, he famously proclaims his literary independence that "I am no pick-purse of anothers wit," though he prides himself upon his poetic reception at court, where, despite a forceful enjambment that interrupts the flow, he brags that "what I speake doth flow / In verse, and that my verse best wits doth please" (sonnet 74).

In his jeremiad against literary theft and critical commentary, Astrophil derides two sorts of Petrarchan verse and commentary available in late-sixteenth-century England. The first is represented by Thomas Watson, who in the hundred poems of his *Hecatompathia* (1582) translated whole passages from Petrarch and Continental Petrarchists and framed them with elaborate headnotes in the manner of Italian commentators.[65] Circulating in manuscript before its publication and appearing in print when *Astrophil and Stella* was nearing completion, the *Hekatompathia* had an impact on Sidney's conception of lyric. Watson's sequence fashions the persona of a speaker different from that of the poet. Its suggestion of a narrative structure introduces techniques that Sidney and other poets would later refine. And its precise headnotes cite texts from ancient Greek and Latin as well as more recent French and Italian authors in the Petrarchan mode.

In their citation of foreign sources, influences, and analogues, these headnotes evoke a sense of national awareness with regard to English culture. Watson's volume opens with commendatory verses in Latin by "C. Downhalus" which remark sourly upon the perceived excellence of French and Italian poetry and which passionately proclaim the need for a countervailing English poetry: "Sola qui[d] interea nullum paris Anglia vatem? / Versifices multi, nemo poeta tibi est" 'Why does England alone beget no poet? You possess many versifiers, but no poet." In sonnets that follow, Watson proposes to enrich England's poetry with models from other nations. But Astrophil refuses

to emulate this approach as he abjures "inventions fine" of other poets (sonnet 1), precedents of "daintie wits" and "*Pindares* Apes" in other texts (sonnet 3), the "wot not what" of amatory convention, "*Aganippe* Well," and "shade of *Tempe*" (sonnet 74), and of course the model of "poore *Petrarchs* long deceased woes" (sonnet 15). Even his view toward literary and linguistic models affirms his peculiar sense of both courtly and anti-courtly styles. The joke is that Astrophil unavoidably asserts ready-made Petrarchan figurations and contrarieties in the teeth of his own denials.[66]

The second sort of commentary that Astrophil derides is represented by the most famous and successful anthology of Elizabethan verse. Richard Tottel's miscellany of *Songes and Sonnettes, written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward the late Earle of Surrey, and others* (1557) includes translations and adaptations of Petrarch by Thomas Wyatt as well as Surrey. To these poems Tottel appends headnotes that contextualize the implied action in real or imagined dramas of passion, intrigue, foolish preoccupation, and cruel betrayal. Such formulations as "the louer being made thrall by loue, perceieth how great a losse is libertye" (poem 330) and "The abused Louer seeth his folly, and enthendeth to trust no more" (poem 39) offer reflective appraisals and practical lessons to admonish and instruct readers.[67] In desperate need of applying this commentary to his own situation, Astrophil casts it aside. Instead of proving himself to be wiser, more prudent, and better adjusted than his Petrarchan predecessors, he shows himself to be fatuous, self-centered, and impervious to constructive criticism.

In the preface to Thomas Newman's pirated first quarto edition of *Astrophil and Stella* (1591), Thomas Nashe located the outcome upon a "scene of idiots" in which "the tragicomedy of love is performed by starlight. . . . The argument cruel chastity, the prologue hope, the epilogue dispair."[68] Sidney no doubt counts upon the perspicacity of his readers to make the same assessment. He composed his poetry for an elite readership and likely for a coterie so intimately acquainted with him that it could laugh at the semblance between Astrophil's follies and his own affairs. Certainly he exercised a tighter control over the manuscript circulation of *Astrophil and Stella* than he did over that of his *Old Arcadia* and political writings, as though to guard its intimate, even scandalous, revelations and perhaps to withhold such "toys and trifles" because of doubt about their ultimate value.[69] The great irony is that its piracy in 1591 ignited enormous curiosity beyond court, and its authorized publication in 1592 made a sensational impact upon a wide readership whose members had no direct dealings with its author. Not the least consequence of its circulation

in London households and the estates of provincial gentry was that it legitimated a certain level of style and a particular form of language, connecting powerfully with a sense of national cultural identity at the end of Elizabeth's reign.

As an inheritor of such style in her own sonnet sequence and pastoral romance, Mary Wroth appropriates some of the ideological underpinnings of her uncle's poetry but rejects others. Just as his poetry stages a conflict between courtly and anti-courtly values, so hers manages a conflict between old-family Sidney values and her loyalty to the new social status conferred upon her as Lady Wroth. Her Pamphilia does not distance herself willfully from others as Astrophil does, but she certainly exists apart from them. The reason is that she is a queen and is therefore distinguished absolutely from those of lesser rank. That was Wroth's fantasy, just as Sidney's fantasy was his aspiration to a titled nobility that he did not possess by birth. The keyword *liberty* which figures so prominently in the poetry of both conveys the sense of a right to title or inheritance which nobility entails but also a right to freedom and self-determination associated with family lineage.[70] Whereas Sidney found himself defending his private rights and public liberties against policies of the Crown and Elizabeth's advisors, Wroth came to project at best a noble indifference to the Crown as she pursued her own affairs independently of king and court.

Wroth's conflict mirrors a linguistic disorder in the public realm when the first part of *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* appeared in print in 1621. That year saw a breakdown in James I's relations with Parliament, a crisis that both parties interpreted as the result of failures in verbal communication. The early victories of the Catholic League in the Thirty Years War had sent James's daughter Elizabeth and her husband, Frederick, the recently crowned king of Bohemia, into exile from Prague in 1620. Deepening economic depression, rising inflation, and popular discontent spawned criticism of the king's profligacy. When James summoned Parliament in January 1621, his lord chancellor, Francis Bacon, warned of dissolution through "the general licentious speaking of state matters."[71] The House of Commons nonetheless proved conciliatory in agreeing to the king's financial requests, and on 27 March it received from him a commendation of its goodwill: "Wee were like the Builders of Babell . . . But hereafter I hope all things wilbe soe cleare betwixt us."[72] On 3 May, however, the House of Lords removed from office James's most eloquent defender of royal prerogative, the same Francis Bacon, who had lobbied to regulate public speech toward a standard of order and clarity which would exemplify royal control.

James's faith in the possibility of a discourse purged of refractory syntax and contentious semantics gave way the following December, when the Lower House petitioned for a war on Spain. To the king's veto the Commons responded by reasserting "the ancient liberty of Parliament for freedom of speech . . . , the same being our ancient and undoubted right and inheritance received from our ancestors," iterating its protestation nine days later by claiming "freedom of speech" as "an ancient and undoubted birthright and inheritance of the subjects of England."[73] James subsequently attacked Parliament's exercise of "ambiguous and general words" against his right to adjudicate "deep matters" and "mysteries of state." From a contemporaneous perspective this conflict might have appeared a war of words, a polarization of rival linguistic claims between a rhetoric of plainness and transparency, on the one hand, and a rhetoric of wonder and astonishment, on the other. Nowhere did the polarization appear more acute than in the language of James I himself, who upbraided Parliament for its failure to avoid ambiguities while taking his own refuge in the privilege of *arcana imperii.*

James could execute his sovereign authority by heeding Francis Bacon's call for linguistic clarity only insofar as he might also retain certain strategic exemptions from it. In the eyes of the aristocracy such exceptions are admissible when the king directs his power against foreigners or commoners or the lawlessness of mob rule but not when he uses it to violate prerogatives of the titled nobility. Against royal infringement and populist encroachment, the nobility hostile to James insisted upon an older feudalist discourse of privilege. But in so doing it found itself entrapped in the same rhetorical tensions between wonder and transparency which had bedeviled the king in 1621.

The characters of *Urania* exemplify this tension. Their external actions in the name of love and communal obligations are those of a courtly aristocracy not entirely sure of its destiny. In the end a vacillation between clarity and obscurity in their language and rhetoric bedevils the characters as they sacrifice their clear-sighted declaration of love to the needs—usually undetermined and indeterminate—of a populace dependent upon them. Wroth's equation of aristocratic values with a commitment to the common good confers upon the monarch a power and authority to express and amplify a supraregional, even national, voice. But it also identifies the nobility as guardians of the nation's interests against those of a potentially overly powerful and authoritarian monarch. It finally requires that these guardians of the nation support their monarch as long the latter's policy remains just and wise.[74] At a time when the concept of the "nation" was increasingly associated with that of the "people,"

Wroth's narrative strongly contests the idea that mob rule takes priority over the rule of a monarch strengthened by a supportive nobility.

In Plato's *Statesman* Socrates had argued on behalf of "full authority for a man who understands the art of kingship and has kingly ability" (294a). The latter can compensate with equity for the rigidity of an impersonal and inflexible law by assigning rewards and punishments to fit individual cases. Wroth's poetry and fiction follows the precedent of her Sidneian forebears in urging noble magistrates to guide the king toward such equity. Her speaker's voice models that of the nation as it offers examples to imitate. It values knowledge and wisdom as prerequisites for practice and action. Virtue becomes a matter of knowing what is good so that one may then act upon it. But such knowledge and its consequences were never so simple as Bacon, the House of Commons, the king, or the nobility imagined—or pretended to imagine. Like the poetry and fiction of Philip Sidney, that of Wroth uncovers complexity and obliquity at the heart of knowing and doing.

Wroth's Petrarchism exemplifies her speaker's conflict in a particularly powerful way. Unconcerned about the culpability of her desires and confident about being able to subdue her erotic urges, Pamphilia represses her instinct for revenge upon the unfaithful Amphilanthus when she realizes that her jealousy threatens the social order. She then tempers her emotional responses even to the point of self-abnegation and self-denial. The foolish hero of *Astrophil and Stella* presents a negative social example to which the unrequited heroine of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* offers a positive response, but the resolution takes place not without conflict. The courtly values endorsed in Wroth's sequence represent the nobility as guardians of the people. But what happens when the discipline to which these values exhort those guardians propels them upon an independent course of action? What happens when the interior illumination that they promote generates a merely prosthetic sense of worth, leading successive generations to view their inherited status with revisionary discomfort or despair? What happens to the growing sense of individual autonomy and private interiority when it is displaced from networks of household and kin which formerly nourished it, to be redirected toward an uncertain future invested in the idea of nationhood? *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* poses these questions and works toward answers in the light of a Petrarchism made ever more complex by the commentaries that addressed it.

9 *Family Narratives*

The Transitional Space of Petrarchism

Astrophil and Stella likely dates from a period just after the eighteen-year-old Penelope Devereux's marriage to Lord Rich on 1 November 1581.[1] Mindful of the peerage to which he aspired, the author imagines an adulterous affair with this young woman, a daughter of the first earl of Essex, considered for marriage with him in 1576 to end their fathers' rivalry.[2] In 1579 her mother, Lettice Knollys, widow of the first earl of Essex, married Sidney's uncle and the queen's favorite, the earl of Leicester, in a scandalous secrecy that incurred the queen's disfavor. Sidney's modern biographers concur that Philip, long avid for a prestigious match, no doubt regretted his decision not to marry into this family when he later realized how powerful such a union of the Leicester-Essex lines could have been.[3] The later marriage of his widow, Frances Walsingham, to Robert Devereux, the second earl of Essex, and Devereux's naming of his own sister, the same Penelope, as an instigator of his rebellion against the Crown in 1600 confirm the inbred loyalties and personal allegiances of this circle.

Lady Mary Wroth belongs to this circle. As a niece of Philip and Mary, she bore the Sidney-Dudley-Leicester heritage on her father's and paternal grandmother's side, along with its devotion to family and the cause of preserving Philip's memory as a Protestant martyr. James I named her father baron of Penshurst in May 1608, thereby fulfilling the dream of his father Henry Sidney, who refused that honor for financial reasons in 1572.[4] Robert Sidney subsequently advanced in estate in August 1618, when he inherited the title of his uncle, the earl of Leicester, thus reclaiming the fortunes of his mother, Mary Dudley, daughter of the duke of Northumberland.[5] Mary Sidney had mean-

while acquired the title of countess through her marriage to the earl of Pembroke in 1580.

Mary Sidney's interest in national affairs followed upon her marriage to Pembroke, and it bears directly upon her subsequent literary activity, including her translations of Petrarch's *Triumph of Death* (1590); Robert Garnier's Senecan drama *Marc-Antoine,* which she published as *Antonius* in 1592 and again as *The Tragedie of Antonie* in 1595; and *Psalms*, completing the work begun by Philip Sidney (published 1599). Her translation of *Marc-Antoine* as "closet drama" has direct political implications.[6] Robert Garnier (1545–90), a Gallican royalist who served both Charles IX and Henry III as chief judicial magistrate for the Maine province at Le Mans, wrote several historical plays on Greco-Roman and biblical themes, mindful of dramatic parallels between their troubled times and his own after the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre which Philip Sidney directly witnessed (23 August 1572). Designed to be read or recited rather than performed as theater, *Marc-Antoine* (published in Paris in 1578) recounts the civil war between Antony and Octavius amid Cleopatra's efforts to save her crown. Its contemporary relevance seems clear. If dissolute Antonius almost certainly figures the debauched Henri III, the sober Octavius might figure the king's younger, more competent brother, François duc d'Anjou, currently on a campaign to free the Netherlands from Spain and, since 1572, a candidate for marriage to Elizabeth I.[7] The conflict pits the protagonists' amatory loyalties against their political allegiances and patriotic sentiments: "For her have I forgone my Country," Antony admits in the play's first scene (7–8), while in act 2 Cleopatra laments the humiliation of "loosing my Realme, loosing my libertie" (405).[8]

How might Mary Sidney relate the play's action to the predicament of her own nation in 1590? Cleopatra is a vulnerable female monarch (Elizabeth?) pressed between a besotted lover (Essex?) and an efficient rival ruler (Philip II?). Octavius might be seen both *in malo* and *in bono* as either a threat to or a salvation for Cleopatra and her kingdom.[9] The duc d'Anjou no longer counted as a suitor for Elizabeth in the 1590s, but, since the imperial might of Spain and the papacy continued to imperil England and Protestant Europe, a portrayal of Octavius *in malo* might evoke the threat of the Spanish Empire and of Rome. A different portrayal of Octavius *in bono* might evoke Leicester's Protestant League intent upon ending England's isolation by forging an alliance with Protestant powers on the Continent, a sort of Protestant Empire designed to counter Philip's Spanish Empire.

The complicating factor is Antony's and Cleopatra's love for each other, represented in the play as the shameful product of "errour and obstinacie"

which "with so strong charmes doth love bewitch our witts" (475, 600). Following Garnier, Mary Sidney incorporates Petrarchan figures and tropes into the play's rhetorical set pieces to signal the lovers' helpless passion and debilitating surrender to it.[10] In the turning point of act 2, when Cleopatra conceives her disastrous plan to manipulate Antony with a false report of her death, her messenger describes her allure in a fourteen-line set piece that approximates a Petrarchan sonnet subdivided into an octave (her physical charms) and a sestet (her affective charms).[11] Mary Sidney accentuates the Petrarchan figurations with a teasing off-rhyme that yields to a strong alliterative couplet:

> Her beamie eies, two Sunnes of this our world,
> Of hir faire haire the fine and flaming golde,
> Her brave streight stature, and hir winning partes
> Are nothing else but fiers, fetters, dartes.
>
> La clairté de ses yeux, deux soleils de ce monde,
> Le fin or rayonnant dessur sa tresse blonde,
> Sa belle taille droitte, et ses frians attraits,
> Ne sont que feux ordans, que cordes, et que traits.
> (723–26)[12]

Not only does the translation of *faire haire* catch the hint of Garnier's internal rhyme (*yeux/deux*), but its syntactic parallels in the final line correlate with the original figures in exact precision. With chameleonic skill Sidney adapts Petrarchan forms to a variety of genres that initially diverge from one another: biblical, dramatic, lyrical, meditational, philosophical, and discursive.

Mary Wroth likewise adapts Petrarchan forms to alien genres that seem initially to resist them. Her pastoral drama *Love's Victory* (1620s?), for example, eschews obvious Petrarchan figurations despite its focus on the amatory tribulations of four pairs of lovers and their several rivals.[13] In the crisis of its fifth act, however, the hero Philisses laments the plan of his beloved Musella's mother to thwart their marriage. His fourteen-line set piece resembles a Petrarchan sonnet cast in couplets. In what corresponds to the octave Philisses urges Musella to suppress her grief: "Then heape nott now more sorrows on my hart, / By thes deere tears which tast of endles smart" (5.1.61–62).[14] In the sestet portion he encourages her to remain true to him in spirit: "Yett lett your love in mee still steddy rest, / And in that I sufficiently am blest" (65–66). Although not the complaint of an unrequited Petrarchan lover, Philisses' lament approximates the structural order of a Petrarchan sonnet.

Mary Sidney's most durable contribution to English national sentiment is

her completion of Philip's translation of Psalms. By 1586 he had rendered forty-three *Psalms* from the Vulgate and possibly Septuagint texts in a variety of meters and rhyme schemes designed to improve upon the poetic qualities of earlier translations by Sternhold and Hopkins (1556), Coverdale's Great Bible (1539; used in the Book of Common Prayer after 1549), the Geneva Bible (1560), and the Bishop's Bible of Matthew Parker (1568).[15] After Philip's death Mary took over, distributing her work across sixteen manuscripts with countless revisions that reflect her own independence in metrical forms, figurative structures, and rhetorical voice.[16] Although only two of her translations deploy the sonnet rhyme scheme (for the strategically placed Psalms 100 and 150), the texture of the whole bears the imprint of Petrarchism.[17] Not the least of its Petrarchan markers is its mise-en-scène. Like the poetry of sixteenth-century sonneteers, that of Psalms unfolds in a courtly setting that brims with issues of sex, politics, and national destiny. Or so it might seem to readers who referred it to the life of its assumed composer, David, as recounted in the Books of Samuel.[18]

In France the Psalms had become battle cries for militant Protestant activists after having been interpreted as responses to events in the troubled times of the shepherd king David by such translators as Clément Marot (1533–43) and such commentators as Martin Bucer (1491–1551), Jean Calvin (1557; English version by Arthur Golding in 1571), and Théodore Beza (1562; English version by Anthony Gilby in 1580).[19] At the end of the century Henri de Navarre could figure in the Huguenot imagination as a modern David slandered, persecuted, and oppressed by his political enemies. This figuration likewise befits the Protestant queen of England, to whom Mary Sidney dedicated her translation in 1599.[20] Elizabeth's own youthful rendition of Psalm 13 provides a model in its call for help against ungodly foes, allowing later readers to identify Goliath with the pope and Saul with her Catholic predecessor, Mary Tudor, or her Catholic rival for the throne, Mary Stuart. In this highly charged atmosphere Psalms provides a nationalistic anthem that depicts the cohesion of a beleaguered people united by a threatened monarch in the strength of their religious faith. In Psalm 44.53–54, for example, the first poem in Mary's continuation of her brother's project, Jerusalem figures as the one true city and Israel as the one true nation where "proverb-like our name is worne, / O how fast in foraine places."[21] The analogues of London and England (or, as it would appear in the Stuart era, an amalgamated Britain with its scripturally evocative northern and southern kingdoms, Scotland and England) as a united new Jerusalem and Israel proved irresistible, however much politicized by doctrinal dispute amid the birth pangs of reform.[22]

To Protestant believers the exemplary, propaedeutic destiny of Britain as an example for other nations might have seemed foreordained.[23] Elizabeth's soon-to-be successor, James I, capitalized upon this national sentiment at the start of his reign. At the Hampton Court Conference of bishops and Puritan leaders in January 1604 he proposed a new translation of the Bible, and at his first Parliament in March 1604 he proposed a Union of England and Scotland in the United Kingdoms of Great Britain.[24] The two proposals were connected in James's imagination. The English Church, anchored in the authority of its bishops and their interpretation of Scripture, would be or become a nationalizing force that might seal and sustain this union.[25] Such ecclesiastical politics proved agreeable to the nobility and the lower classes, especially as it promised to exercise control over a confused church and provide a secular counter to the disturbingly theocratic impulses of a growing Puritan bourgeoisie. It appealed to the clergy as well by promoting them as instruments for the king's vision of a corporate nation.

The translation of Psalms in the King James Bible registers just such a vision in which the local and regional idea of *nation* in the Geneva text gives way to an expansive idea of it as a large-scale, translocal, supraregional political entity. Philip and Mary Sidney's translation of Psalms, with its modified Petrarchan diction and Petrarchan figuration, appears as a transition between these ideas. In the King James version of Psalm 33.12, for example, the connective *and* implies that the nation and its people are one, united under a king in a centralized system of rule: "Blessed *is* the nation [*to ethnos*/ *gens*] whose God *is* the LORD; *and* the people [*to laos*/ *populus*] *whome* he hath chosen for his own." In the Geneva version, however, the word *euen* implies a disjunction between the nation and its people, undercutting kingly power so as to suggest that God directs both king and people independently of each other: "Blessed *is* that nacion whose God is the Lord: *euen* the people *that* he hathe chosen for his own inheritance." The Geneva commentary reinforces this idea of God's absolute governance: "Kings and the mightie of the worlde can not be saued by worldelie meanes, but onely by Gods prouidence." Philip Sidney's translation retains the connective *even,* but for *nation* it substitutes *Realme,* literally "the king's estate" (French *royaume*) which noblemen protect by serving as the king's warriors. In this way Sidney implies the contribution of the military nobility to public policy:

> That Realme indeede hath blisse
> Whose God he is,
> Who him for their Lord take:

Even people that, ev'n those,
Whom this Lord chose
His heritage to make.
(33.43–48)

In the King James version of Psalm 72.11 the concrete verb *fall down before* expresses the self-abasement of foreign kings before the divinely anointed monarch of a mighty nation: "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations [*ta ethnē*/*gentes*] shall serve him." In the Geneva version the abstract *worship* lends a liturgical significance to the action, reflecting God's will: "Yea, all Kings shal worship him: all nations shall serue him." Of "this godlie King" (identified as Solomon, the son and heir of psalmic David) the Geneva commentary instructs that "God wil bothe prosper his life, & also make the people willing to obeie him," as though the subjects' compliance were wholly in God's hands. Mary Sidney's translation likewise associates the *nation* with the most prominent members of such a polity, those who "stand / At [kings'] command," not all the common people or even all the gentry and nobility but only those of the very highest rank who assist the king in carrying out God's will:

Nay all, ev'n all
Shall prostrate fall,
That crownes and scepters weare:
And all that stand
At their command,
That crownes and scepters beare.
(72.35–40)

The Psalmist's idea of a threatened nation protected by its warrior class would have meant a great deal to Mary Wroth as daughter of the baron of Penshurst and second earl of Leicester. Such titles were esteemed by a family that had been denied them by Elizabeth. By the time James awarded them, the family perhaps overvalued these symbolic associations, though it did not succumb to their allure as many Stuart appointees did. Even after Wroth's marriage in 1604 and her absorption into Queen Anne's circle at court, she took pains to preserve the legacy of her Sidneian independence. Echoes of her father's, aunt's, and uncle's texts abound in her work. In all these forebears Petrarchism plays an important role, not least for its power to adapt and to merge with scriptural verse, dramatic monologue, meditational poetry, and Ovidian elegy.

Wroth's father provided her link to the past. Like Philip Sidney, Robert devoted his talents to public service, talents that, like those of his brother, in-

cluded poetic composition. Just as Philip likely wrote his sonnets in the frustration of being ostracized, so Robert likely wrote his about 1597 when, as governor of Flushing, he sought but was denied a return to court and an office in England.[26] And, just as Philip's sequence refers to the courtly world in which a sovereign object of desire manipulates her subjects with feigned love, so does Robert's. The latter's songs and sonnets (1596–98?) narrate a lover's response to his beloved's betrayals in which the names of the speaker and beloved are identified as Rosis (Robert Sidney) and Lysa (Elizabeth) in Pastoral Song 7.[27] Not simply disdainful or unyielding, she has been actively untruthful and repeatedly injurious. He responds with self-pity and indignation. In sonnet 34, "Ah deerest lims my lifes best ioy and stay / how must I thus let yow bee cutt from mee," for example, he renounces his unfaithful beloved and compares himself as to a sick man who bids farewell to his amputated limbs, "full of dead Gangreins." He sees very clearly that he must give up part of himself in order to preserve the rest, "whose death of part health of the rest must bee." He must either relinquish Lysa or putrefy: "Alas my loue from no infections free, / like law doth giue of it or my decay." The figure takes on a macabre resonance in light of the gangrenous demise of the author's brother at Zutphen. Within the bounds of the Sidney family, Robert amputates from his own poetry his brother's witty, sly, ironies about the lover's complicity in the beloved's fault or his blindness to her deceit.

Repeating the conventions of adulterous love established in *Astrophil and Stella,* Robert Sidney's sonnets offer at least in part a critique of the sexual license allowed to a libidinous male in the upper reaches of Elizabethan society. This license, one sanctioned laterally among a polycentric international aristocracy, might seem a hypothetical compensation for other sorts of discipline urged upon the ruling class at school, at court, in war, and in administrative service to the state and nation.[28] Still, its real consequences might well jeopardize the vertical benefits of such service at home and abroad. Robert Sidney's sonnets show the depth of this crisis. In sonnet 33 the lover reproaches Lysa for appearing to "take pleasure in your cruelty," but he nonetheless submits to her domination "Since that there is all inequality . . . / Between my bands and your sovereignty." Like the amatory tribulations of Astrophil or long-deceased Petrarch, his come to figure as the just desserts of a self-indulgence that is draining vitality from the nation's elite. In sonnet 39, for example, Rosis anticipates "a safe thogh homely rest" when he renounces Lysa, but he does not in fact return "home." No sooner does he declare his leave-taking than she repents, and he slips back into his "old bonds." And, after making "for amends, large

promises," she reverts to her old devices. Rosis is foolish for complaining, "trusting on so fayre words, yowr word yow brake," in which the strategically misplaced participial phrase can refer either to him as a deceived lover or to Lysa as a deceiving beloved. Betrayer and betrayed bleed into one as a symptom of their self-absorption.

Mary Wroth's sonnets register the overcoming of such pain through recourse to elevated constancy. As her father excised from his poetry the mischievous gaiety of *Astrophil and Stella,* she eliminates from hers the cynical gloom and overripe weariness of his. Although *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* deals with the beloved's repeated infidelities, its speaker refuses to revile him. As in Petrarch's *Rime sparse,* but from the conflicted perspective of her role as queen, Pamphilia idealizes her beloved. Her turn toward Petrarchism plays out possibilities of sublimating the erotic drive just as Petrarch's *Rime sparse* had done, so that her amatory experiences stake out a positive site to exemplify virtue. Wroth looks to her father's and uncle's representations of adulterous love, and she recoils from their negative implications.

Toward the end of the sequence one striking example of inversion occurs in Wroth's series of fourteen poems constructed as a "Crowne of Sonnets Dedicated to Love" (P77–90), in which the last line of each sonnet becomes the first line of the next and the final line of the entire group repeats its opening line. In relational terms the series recalls a similarly structured "crown" begun by Robert Sidney. There the topic that unites his series of four poems (sonnets 11 to 14, with the fragment of a fifth, poem 15) is the speaker's confession of inconstancy and his plea of having willed it for the best: "Ah let not mee, for changing blame indure / whoe onely changd, by chang to finde the best" (sonnet 14). While this crown dramatizes the spiraling descent of a carnal love, Wroth's dramatizes her speaker's effort to elevate her love.[29] His describes a sensual labyrinth with the raging Minotaur at its center, but hers describes a spiritual one, though with an outcome not self-evidently resolved. The custodians of the labyrinth were, after all, lustful women, the unchaste Pasiphae and the passionate Ariadne, problematic models for Wroth's Pamphilia.

Wroth's "Crowne of Sonnets" appropriately evokes Petrarch's figure of the labyrinth in its first and last lines, supplying a frame for the series: "In this strang labourinth how shall I turne?"[30] The model derives from Petrarch's sonnet 211, "Voglia mi sprona, Amor mi guida et scorge" 'Desire spurs me, Love guides and escorts me,' whose speaker finds himself unwilling or unable to extricate himself: "Nel laberinto intrai, né veggio ond'esca" 'I entered the labyrinth, nor do I see where I may get out of it.' Entered on the historical

date of 6 April 1327, the site affords a concrete emblem of the lover's personal and poetic predicament.[31] In at least one commentary, however, the figure evokes positive and productive features of love's possibilities. Gesualdo stretches the context of Petrarch's poem when he refers to an unpublished Neoplatonic discourse on love by Minturno: "Ma il laberintho d'amore, é di magisterio diuino come dal Minturno dipinto sia" 'But the labyrinth of love is part of divine teaching, as it is portrayed by Minturno' (cclxii[r]). Unlike deceptive labyrinths, this one opens new paths for the lover to progress toward transcendent love, thereby countering the maze of sensuality contemned in the *Rime sparse.*

Wroth's "Crowne of Sonnets" exploits these conflicting interpretations. It narrates a series of transactions between perceiving the labyrinth *in malo* as a site of amatory doubt, suspicion, and turmoil and experiencing it *in bono* as a site of wholly sublimated, fully achieved love.[32] When the series opens, its speaker sees perils that could impede her progress: "Wayes are on all sids while the way I miss" (sonnet 1 [P77]). As she proceeds, she takes hold of a "thread of love / Which line straite leads unto the soules content" (sonnet 2 [P78]), and she arrives at the interior, where "content of lovers wittniseth true love" (sonnet 6 [P82]).[33] As Pamphilia follows this thread, she takes on the part of Theseus, inverting gendered expectations that might conventionally assign this heroic role to Amphilanthus and the hapless role of Ariadne to her. The inversion works two ways. On the one hand, it confers upon Pamphilia a degree of masculine-identified boldness that signals her willingness to confront Love's challenge head on. On the other, it exposes her liability to the usually masculine-identified spasms of jealousy and suspicion which might afflict her male counterpart.[34] Sonnet 1 sets up this conflict as the speaker ponders the direction she should take: "If to the right hand, there in love I burn; / . . . If to the left, suspicion hinders bliss." In the end Pamphilia adduces a heightened sense of fulfillment for having crossed the labyrinth, though not without professing a genuine confusion: "Soe though in Love I fervently doe burne, / In this strange labourinth how shall I turne?" (sonnet 14 [P90]).

Wroth's preference for an affirmative model of the labyrinth owes much to alternative accounts of Petrarchan love registered in the commentaries. The Petrarchan model there provides Wroth a holding pattern, an emotional prototype, and a transitional space for her own development, enabling her to fashion her public voice while sharing a poetic form with members of her family. In his "Family Romance" Freud remarks that such bonds of affection constitute "an expression of the child's longing for the happy, vanished days

when his father seemed . . . the noblest and strongest of men and his mother the dearest and lovliest of women" (*Works* 9.241). I would argue that Wroth's Petrarchism revisits the source of her father's and her uncle's poetic achievements in the Petrarchan mode and confers a sublimated value upon their expressions of affect and longing.

With its expansive sense of interior time and recovered space Wroth's sonnet 10, first series (P11), "The weary traveller who tired sought," affords an instructive contrast to Robert Sidney's sonnet 17, "The endless Alchymist, with blinded will." Both evoke a Petrarchan model with important sixteenth-century commentaries. Sidney's Rosis compares himself to an alchemist who tirelessly "feeds his thoughts with hopes, his hopes on shows / And more his worke proves vain, more eager grows." The object of his quest, "dreams of gold," proves "false trust of wealth," but yet he admits to "sail on still, / While my corrupted sense doth think it sees / The long-sought land of rest." By contrast, Wroth's Pamphilia compares herself to a "weary traveller" (male, in a conscious negation of her own gender) who seeks an end "of paine, or labour" and finally attains it when "with joy" he is "to his home back brought." According to the terms of this comparison, Pamphilia attains the "greatest hapines" when she comes upon "beleef for fayth." The apparent cause of her unease has been some "wrong conseite" of rumor or malicious gossip against her. In the opening lines of sonnet 8, first series (P9), "Led by the powre of griefe, to waylings brought," the speaker hints darkly that she has been slandered "by faulce consiete of change fall'ne on my part." Now in the concluding couplet of sonnet 10 she announces that "wrong conseite" has given way to the "acknowledg'd" truth of her constancy: "Truth saith t'was wrong conseite bred my despite / Which once acknowledg'd, brings my harts delight."

A model for this topos of the traveler comes from Petrarch's sonnet 16, "Movesi il vecchierel canuto et bianco / Del dolce loco ov'à sua età fornita" 'The little white-haired pale old man leaves the sweet place where he has filled out his age.' At first sight the parallel might seem dubious. Petrarch uses the figure to compare the speaker's longing for Laura to a pilgrim's pursuit of Christ's image on Veronica's veil. The long slow rhythm of Petrarch's opening lines, the weight of *m* and *n* sounds in its second quatrain ("indi trahendo poi l'antico fianco / Per l'extreme giornate di sua vita" 'thence dragging his ancient flanks through the last days of his life'), and the quickening pace in its first tercet as the old man approaches Rome and the sacred object of his pilgrimage ("Et viene a Roma, seguendo 'l desio" 'And he comes to Rome following his desire') echo the protagonist's arduous movement. The word *desio* connects

this old man and Petrarch's speaker. Both are haunted by a profound desire to capture and reclaim what remains absent—Christ's presence for the old man, the beloved Laura for the speaker.

The sole support for each is hope, a virtue rendered by the active verb *spera* in the simile's final line. The old man might transfer the fulfillment of his hope to the afterlife. The speaker, however, can relieve his anxiety only by encountering Laura in this life. Because of Laura's resistance to him and, more especially, because of the geographical distance between them while he is in Rome, he compensates by seeking the beloved's likeness among other women:

> Così, lasso, talor vo cerchand'io,
> Donna, quanto è possibile in altrui
> La disiata vostra forma vera.
>
> Thus, alas, at times I go searching in others, Lady, as much as is possible, for your longed-for true form.

What he finds, of course, is not Laura but competing versions of her, a reminder of her physical beauty without its real substance. The poem's careful juxtaposition of Laura's face with the Savior's, its deliberate blurring of sacred and profane, its scandalous slippage of the human into the divine, startled at least some sixteenth-century readers. Sylvano da Venafro, for example, remarks negatively that "la comparatione e odiosa, [el Sonetto e chiaro]" 'the comparison is odious, [the sonnet is self-explanatory]' (xv^{v}).

In Wroth's poem the distance that separates the lover from the beloved causes some misunderstanding and "wrong conseite" that alienates the lover from the beloved. A similar misunderstanding occurs in Petrarch's poem as a result of spatial distance. For most of the commentators Petrarch is in Italy on diplomatic business for the Avignon papacy, whereupon he discovers a sense of his own Italian national identity and the charms of Italian women. Filelfo notes that, although Petrarch addresses Laura as his "Donna" as if she were present, the locative in "viene a Roma" 'he comes to Rome' specifies that he is writing this poem at his desk in Rome: "Era il petrarcha gia in Italia gionto e fermatosi qui . . . scripse allamata sua madonna Laura" 'Petrarch had already arrived in Italy and, established here, . . . he wrote to his beloved Laura' (22^{v}). Lonely in a distant land and surrounded by charming women, the speaker has good reason to search for a reminder of Laura's beauty. As Filelfo explains, "vo cerchand'io . . . in altrui" 'I go searching in others' means that the speaker seeks in other women an approximation of Laura, a pale shadow "in qualche altra donna. Il che e cosi possibile come chel sudario si risomiglia al uiso de

yhesu" 'in some other woman. This is possible just as Veronica's veil resembles the face of Jesus' (23v).

Other commentators emphasize moral differences. Fausto writes that Petrarch's speaker takes no satisfaction in other women because their beauties are only physical, whereas Laura's are spiritual: "L'una ragione e che se considera la bellezza dell'anima, forma par non fu mai da'l di che Adamo aperse gl'occhi" 'The one reason is that if he considers her soul's beauty, no equal form ever existed since the day that Adam opened his eyes" (10v). For Bernardino Daniello the speaker has already passed through Rome en route to a farther destination in Naples: "Era gia giunto in Napoli il Po. quando il presente Son. compuose" 'The poet had already arrived in Naples when he composed the present sonnet' (8r). Having resisted the seductive allure of Roman women, the speaker writes to the beloved and proclaims his fidelity to her.

Gesualdo articulates the consequences. During his visit to Rome the speaker has undergone a severe test in his constancy to Laura: "E possiamo stimare ch'egli si ritrouasse peruentura in parte, ou'eran molte e belle donne, e quelle intentamente mirasse ciascuna fiso guardando" 'And we can imagine that perhaps again he found himself in places where there were many beautiful women; and that looking fixedly at each one, he intently admired them' (xvr). His behavior prompts rumors. Upon returning to Avignon, he must now convince Laura that he has indeed been faithful to her. Focusing upon the vocative *Donna* in line 13, Gesualdo situates the speaker in Laura's presence as he attempts to persuade her of his devotion: "Per dimostrare altrui, che non per loro amore le riguardaua, Ma per la detta cagione, s'alcuno era che dubitato n'hauesse, a lei le parole indrizzi dicendo" 'To show that he would gaze upon others not because of love for them, but for the expressed reason that if there were any who doubted him, he might address these words to her' (xvir). Admitting that in Rome he cast eyes upon other women, he nonetheless argues that he did so only because they reminded him of Laura.

Gesualdo's narrative provides an analogue for Mary Wroth's sonnet 10. It concerns Pamphilia's need to verify her absolute fidelity to Amphilanthus against malicious rumors that would allege otherwise. Petrarch's journey to far-off places offers apparent grounds to substantiate the slanderous charges against him. In Pamphilia's case the hazards of journey offer a metaphoric vehicle to describe her situation. Because of society's double standard, the charges brought against her carry more serious consequences than those against Petrarch. This resolution brings a release from fear: "When past is feare, content like soules assend." Just as a traveler feels relief after having

passed through the hazards of a journey, so does Pamphilia after having disproved the threat to her reputation:

> Hee tired with his paines, I, with my mind;
> Hee all content receaves by ease of limms;
> I, greatest hapines that I doe find
> Beeleefe for fayth, while hope in pleasure swimms.

Wroth's speaker breaks the Petrarchan mold even as she reconstitutes it. Her equanimity seems a counter to the unrestrained egotism of such lovers as her father's Rosis or her uncle's Astrophil, and she offers a positive example of Petrarchan love. Philip Sidney provides a narrative antitype for her in sonnet 91 of his *Astrophil and Stella.* There Astrophil complains about absence from his beloved, incurred "by honour's cruell might," quite possibly during some sort of service to the state that has taken him abroad. Wishing to refute rumors that have reached her about his infidelity, he reinvents the Petrarchan defense that Stella's rivals remind him of her: "They please I do confesse, they please mine eyes, / But why? Because of you they models be." No matter what she hears about them, he deems them secondary to her: "If you heare that they seeme my hart to move, / Not them, O no, but you in them I love." The argument, blunted by the off-rhyme *move/love,* actually affirms that, when he is not near the woman he loves, he loves the women he's near. Astrophil is a witty speaker who abuses speech, everywhere signaling his imposition as a lover, his disappointment as an ambitious young gentleman, and his impending political failure in consequence of both.[35]

Pamphilia's constancy and integrity are wholly different. As Wroth directs Pamphilia's concerns to her active agency, she effects a subtle shift in rhetorical dynamics. One of the important conventions of sonnet discourse since the Italian *stil nuovo* is that a lover's constancy, and hence changelessness, has the power to effect great change—and a corresponding constancy—in collective behavior. It does so for the better when it inspires human beings to virtuous action and for the worse when it drives them to reckless deeds. Such poets as Lorenzo de' Medici used this motif to reflect upon the possibility that a ruler's devotion to a worthy beloved underpins the effective operation of an entire polity. Du Bellay and the Pléiade addressed this motif to the conduct of the aristocracy. Philip Sidney did the reverse by showing how Astrophil's inappropriate behavior drives him to emotional bankruptcy and professional ruin, "unable quite to pay even Natures rent, / Which unto it by birthright I do ow" (sonnet 18). Mary Wroth by contrast revives the Continental precedent that

envisions moral benefits in society through transformations in the lover's and beloved's characters. As Cesare Gonzaga argues in book 3 of Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier,* lovers make each other better persons, their mutual improvement benefiting the community to which they belong: "For he that loveth, alwaie coveteth to make himselfe as lovely as he can, and evermore dreadeth fears that he take no foile, that shoulde make him little set by" (Hoby, trans., 234).

In the light of Philip Sidney's negative example in *Astrophil and Stella,* I construe the Petrarchism of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* as a positive site for Wroth. It affords a transitional space and a locus for interplay between herself and her illustrious family, on the one hand, and between them and the negative world of courtly life, on the other. Its poetic conventions transcend the writer's fantasies and subjective imagination as well as the legacy of her family's earlier achievement. They extend backward to the inheritance of a cumulative Sidneian poetics, and they project forward to the author's autonomous literary production. The scope of her inheritance enables Wroth to develop as a poet who explores a variety of modes that incorporate scriptural imitation, verse drama, and pastoral romance as her family developed them.

A final shaping force upon her poetry was Mary Sidney's son William Herbert, Wroth's first cousin, adulterous lover, and the father of her two illegitimate children. Like Amphilanthus, for whom he provided a real-life prototype, and like his uncles Philip and Robert Sidney, the third earl of Pembroke labored to serve as a leader of his nation, and, like them, he punctuated his public career with fashionable love poetry.[36] Here, however, the Petrarchan current cedes to a more self-consciously classical and witty—and largely apolitical—Ovidianism. In 1660, thirty years after Herbert's death, John Donne Jr. published *Poems, Written by the Right Honorable William Earl of Pembroke, Lord Steward of his Majesties Houshold.* The volume includes replies "answered by way of Repartee" by Sir Benjamin Rudyard and other poems by such earlier and later contemporaries as Walter Ralegh, Edward Dyer, and Michael Drayton in the Elizabethan style; Henry Wotton in the Jacobean style; and Thomas Carew, Henry King, and William Strode in the Caroline style, all ripe for musical settings by such distinguished composers as John Dowland, Nicholas Lanyer, and Henry Lawes to whom the Sidneys had given patronage.[37] The Ovidian variety that Herbert prefers, and in which he excels, sports lightly lascivious, self-consciously charming, wholly unregenerate verse about the travails of an adulterous lover who runs like a stag, chest first, a little cruelly, in pursuit of his sometimes fickle mistress, herself much the better for being a little bad.

In this frankly libidinous verse Herbert's persona flaunts his profligacy. A

song poem entitled "That he will still persevere in his Love" juxtaposes the speaker's feeble declaration of constancy against his vigorously shifting, robustly inconstant free verse form, a technique intimating the sophisticated forms of the writer's famous poet-cousin, George Herbert (36). A nine-stanza pastoral ode entitled "A Sonnet" (38, in which *sonnet* is used in the extended sense of a short poem rather than a specific fourteen-line form) promises the mistress a treasure of flora and fauna in exchange for her attention:

> DEar leave thy home and come with me,
> That scorn the world for love of thee:
> Here we will live within this Park,
> A Court of joy and pleasures Ark.
>
> Here we will hunt, here we will range,
> Constant in Love, our sports wee'l change:
> Of hearts if any change we make,
> I will have thine, thou mine shalt take.

The speaker acknowledges his voracious sexual appetite and emotional volatility, but only rarely does he appear to recognize his beloved's feelings. The "Description of a wisht Mistris" in fourteen quatrains outdoes any classified advertisement for a midtown escort service:

> And I would have her full of wit,
> So she know how to huswife it;
> But she whose insolence makes her dare
> To cry her wit, wil sell more ware.
>
> (79)

Specifying exactly what he wants, he leaves his prospective partner little space for her own voluptuary wish list.

Mary Wroth's heroine in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* aims to counter exactly such emotional poverty tolerated in William Herbert's poetry. In sonnet 39 (P 45) she disdains "pleasant witts" (Herbert and his buddies?) who enjoy their own "fram'd words, which I account the dross / Of purer thoughts" and avers (of those wits? or their words?) that "your plenty shews your want." The topos, echoing Ovid's "inopem me copia fecit" 'my riches beggars me' (*Metamorphoses* 3.466), refers to Narcissus, whose abundant beauty eluded his own grasp. Pamphilia imputes to poets such as Herbert a narcissistic discourse trapped in its own self-admiring excess. In sonnet 40 (P46) she explicitly rebukes the trumpery of her beloved's show of affection:

> Itt is nott love which you poore fooles do deeme
> That doth apeare by fond, and outward showes
> Of kissing, toying, or by swearings glose,
> O noe thes are farr off from loves esteeme.

Pamphilia appears determined to counteract such niggling indifference.

As a young man, Amphilanthus's historical counterpart experienced the finest tutelage available to any nobleman of his class and generation, and in at least one prominent instance it included some explicit instruction in steeling himself against the debilitating effects of intemperate pastimes. In January 1593 Dr. Thomas Moffett, a learned member of the Royal College of Physicians and a beneficiary of Mary Sidney's largess at Wilton, composed a Latin oration on the life of Philip Sidney as a New Year's gift for the twelve-year-old William Herbert. Entitled *Nobilis sive vitae mortisque Sydniadis Synopsis* 'The Noble Man or a View of a Sidney's Life and Death,' it presents Sidney's life as a fit paradigm for Herbert's.[38] *Nobilis* situates love poetry among the pursuits that Sidney abandoned when he embraced public service on behalf of the nation: "Later, when he had begun to enter into the deliberations of the commonwealth [*in cogitationem reipub.*], he did not cling to his own pleasures, but gave up love, poetry, sport, . . . and other clogs upon the mind" (fols. 14^{v}–15^{r} and pp. 80–81). Freed from these passions, Sidney turned to "the fatherland [*patria*] and affairs of state [*Totus patriae commodis invigilavit*]" as sites worthy of serious commitment (fol. 15^{r} and p. 81).

Despite Moffett's claims, Herbert might have deduced that his uncle had gained something valuable from pursuing a literary career, since the study of ancient and modern foreign languages enabled him freely to converse in other tongues when visiting abroad: "Entertained by people of various nationality [*varijs gentibus*]—Greeks, Romans, Italians, Frenchmen, Germans—he responded to each man in his own tongue" (fol. 15^{v} and p. 81). Public service identified the Sidneys so much with the tenor of the nation that to malign the former was to impugn the latter: "For no one ever wished ill to the honor of the Sidneys except him who wished ill to the commonwealth [*publico*]" (fol. 16^{r} and p. 82). This example shaped family mythology. After assuming his title as third earl of Pembroke in 1601 and following a brief banishment from court for impregnating one of the queen's ladies in waiting, William Herbert entered political life in the shadow of his illustrious forebears. Attaining prominence in 1615 by helping the earl of Buckingham to supplant Somerset in the king's favor, he often worked against royal policies, though never in active opposition to them.[39] Like others of the nobility, he pushed for measures

beneficial to his propertied interests by sponsoring key members of the House of Commons such as Sir Benjamin Rudyard. In 1615 he was appointed lord chancellor with responsibilities for appointing and controlling James's personal servants and for managing royal banquets and entertainments.[40] One of his most notable public efforts was his colonizing investment in the Virginia Company and his involvement in preventing its dissolution at the king's command in 1623–24.

Evidence suggests that Herbert's surviving poetry was the product of his youth, so that by abandoning it after 1615 he appears to have followed Moffett's antipoetic advice. One compelling motivation for Mary Wroth to write *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* might well have been an effort in the poetic modes of her uncle, aunt, and father to persuade her cousin and her lover otherwise. In the second part of *Urania* Wroth gestures toward Herbert's poetic talent by incorporating into the narrative one of his lyrics, "Had I loved butt att that rate." Amphilanthus composed the verse "when hee made a shew of love" to one of Pamphilia's rivals. Pamphilia nonetheless appropriates it, singing "by the eare" in a voice that flattens Amphilanthus when it "makes the roome rattle" (Second Part 30). Not one to shy away from public confrontation, nor to be debased by grudging affect, Wroth's heroine demonstrates the empowering effect of a deeply felt love and its expression in verse.[41]

Wroth's literary production argues that, far from undermining the workings of the state or interfering with the conduct of the nation, the pursuit of poetry and romance enhances both. *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* demonstrate that an extended debate about virtue and a lover's behavior in the transitional space of Petrarchism can deepen and expand the range of options available to a public discourse. By rewriting her family's texts from this perspective, Wroth shows that readers like Moffett misunderstood her uncle's focus on love when they interpreted it as detrimental to the commonweal, or "nation," as one might translate Moffett's Latin phrase *res publica.* As in *Astrophil and Stella,* the workings of Petrarchan love in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* initiate a debate about alternative possibilities of behavior and response. Petrarchan commentaries provide insight into these possibilities, and such commentaries include ones on an already emerging English poetry. Among them pride of place belongs to Philip Sidney's *A Defence of Poetry.*

10 *An Apology for Uncles*

Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poetry*

As Mary Wroth understood, Philip Sidney's imitation of Petrarch's amatory woes allowed her uncle wide scope to represent Astrophil's self-defeating behavior and his own prospects to mend his ways. As a self-reflexive text, *Astrophil and Stella* consequently inscribes not just an instance of the Petrarchan mode but also a critical attitude toward it. Sidney's remarks about love poetry in *A Defence of Poetry* (1580–81?) suggest that it is a conflicted attitude. Celebrating the "golden world" of Greek poetry and the "vatic" world of Roman poetry while bracketing as privileged models the divinely inspired Psalms, Song of Songs, and scriptural hymns, *A Defence* contends that modern Italian forms such as the sonnet and canzone can supplement the former. Among English works suitable for the national canon, Sidney mentions those of Gower and of Chaucer, in general (74), and the Italian-inspired *The Knight's Tale* (101) and *Troilus and Criseyde* (112), in particular. Among recent texts he mentions (though with qualifications) *Gorboduc,* the *Mirror for Magistrates,* and *The Sheapherdes Calender,* and he commends the earl of Surrey's Petrarchan sonnets, which befit "a noble birth, and are worthy of a noble mind" (112).[1]

Such "passionate sonnets" as those emulating Petrarch's *Rime sparse* nonetheless run the risk that, like corrupting "comedies" whose actions "abuseth men's wit, training it to wanton sinfulness and lustful love," they might "rather teach than reprehend amorous conceits" (103). But, if abusive poetry has corrosive power, the converse may also be true. Insisting that good poetry should move the reader to a persuasive end, Sidney argues that "it is not *gnosis* but *praxis* must be the fruit" (91). This praxis or capacity for action requires as

much a defense of the reader's immanent response as of the text's contingent merit.[2] Among competing genres, amatory poetry affords a testing ground to assess a lover's ethos, to detect the latter's flaws, and to consider one's like or unlike behavior. The protests of "poore *Petrarchs* long deceased woes" should move wise readers to question the grounds of such utterances (sonnet 15). A prudent response might prompt derision, "for the representing of so strange a power in love procureth delight, and the scornfulness of the action stirreth laughter." The complaints of "a busy loving courtier" such as Astrophil ought to stimulate reflective judgment and moral discrimination (116).

Reflective judgment and moral discrimination are cognitive acts, matters of gnosis rather than praxis, and their psychological complexity thwarts any simple understanding of praxis as an imitation of virtue or vice in lived experience: "And however *praxis* cannot be, without being moued to practise, is no hard matter to consider" (91). Supremely overdetermined by its triple negative, this sentence could mean, "It is not difficult to fathom how *praxis* follows from understanding." But, because Elizabethan usage sometimes construed the double negative as an intensive negation, the sentence could also mean the opposite, "It is indeed difficult to fathom how *praxis* follows from understanding." Praxis can and must result from deep persuasion—in Plato's *Protagoras* 352c and 356c–358d, for example, Socrates argues that to know the good is to be compelled to do the good—but the precise relationship of stimulus to response eludes definition. It surely encompasses more than any bland counsel to imitate virtuous deeds, despite the allure, some say, of such strange bedfellows as William Bennett's *Book of Virtues* and Oscar Wilde's dictum that life imitates art. Literature may be an imitative art, but it does not necessarily compel an imitative response. Its effect may be gnosis that leads to persuasion, but how persuasion leads to action invites countless possibilities.

Support for unbalancing these relations between gnosis and praxis comes from the earliest known commentary upon *A Defence.* Written probably in 1585 by William Temple (1555–1627), a Cambridge graduate who became Sidney's secretary in November of that year, the Latin *Analysis tractationis de Poesi contextae a nobilissimo viro Philippe Sidneio equite aurato* 'An Analysis of the Treatise on Poetry Written by the Most Noble Philip Sidney, Knight,' attempts a rigorous cross-examination of the text. As a logician trained in Ramist method, Temple had earlier published *P. Rami Dialecticae libri duo* 'Two Books Concerning Ramus's Dialectic' (1584).[3] When he explicates *A Defence* he draws minute attention to the technical procedures of its argument, both clarifying and complicating its half-hidden syllogisms. Ramism as em-

braced by Temple limits rhetoric to the use of figures, tropes, and other elocutionary devices, achieving "its proper purpose as long as it is spoken well." Persuasion has little to do with logic, since logic properly concerns only the partition of abstract relationships: "For while persuasion may be brought about by the force of sound thought, logical invention does not consider sound thoughts, but rather the parts of a sound thought, divorced from all considerations of disposition" (75). Concurring with Protestant belief in the priority of faith over works and the conviction that virtuous agency, indifferent to reason or persuasion, occurs only through God's grace, Temple privileges gnosis over praxis as a component of heroic action. Because success is the unmerited result of a foreordained providence, heroes never truly earn any victory but can only learn what it signifies in relation to God's will. Their task is not so much to defeat the enemy as to recognize the enemy's strength and have faith in God's providence.[4]

In subordinating praxis to gnosis, Temple considers its relation to forces other than persuasion. If *praxis* were simply an effect of knowledge, it would not be greater than knowledge: "Since an effect is itself produced by a cause, it will in fact be either inferior to its cause, or equal at best." Temple's denial of praxis as a superior effect leads him to disparage persuasion through rhetoric while exalting the power of illumination through gnosis: "We are only taught by that which brings about some sort of knowledge in the mind; yet this does not happen by any 'moving,' but only by the force and illumination of an argument, ordered through the rules of judgment. . . . Thus it will follow that teaching is of a higher degree than moving" (115). Hence, gnosis and the illumination that results from it are the primary goals of literary art and the major ones that writers achieve when they aim to serve the nation. Literature does not so much rouse citizens to perform virtuous deeds as it challenges them to examine and evaluate the possibilities of virtuous action.

One consequence is that heroic stature no longer depends upon feats of physical prowess, gendered as masculine and classed as noble. It instead depends upon acts of the mind theoretically indifferent to gender and class, or so Plato claims in book 5 of the *Republic* (454d–e). A writer such as Mary Wroth may imagine a character, female or male, in response to her uncle's poetry and to the idea of heroism which *A Defence* implies. And so might Sidney. In *A Defence* he fantasizes how he would react to Petrarchistic conceits if he were their female recipient: "But truly many of such writings as come under the banner of unresistible love, if I were a mistress, would never persuade me they were in love: so coldly they apply fiery speeches." Such "fiery speeches" deploy

"a courtesan-like painted affectation," "far-fet words," a "dictionary" alliteration, and "winter-starved" flowers of speech. The remedy is a "forcibleness or *energia* (as the Greeks call it)" which might achieve "the right use of the material point of poesy" (116–117). But even these terms are fraught with complication. By *material point,* for example, Sidney means the dangerous and debilitating attributes of enchanting words, alluring effects, and rhetorical figurations whose hazardous potential derives from the feminized origins of poetry as "the mother of lies, . . . the nurse of abuse, infecting us with many pestilent desires; with a siren's sweetness drawing the mind to the serpent's tail of sinful fancies" (101).[5] From a perspective of feminine matter contending with masculine form and masculine substance giving way to feminine accident, the *misomousoi* (haters of the muses) have asserted that poetry weakens the moral fiber of whole peoples and races (99): "Both in other nations and in ours, before poets did soften us, we were full of courage, given to martial exercises, the pillars of manlike liberty, and not lulled asleep in shady idleness with poets' pastimes" (101–2). Sidney sets out to defeat this belief by directing its meaning toward other frames of reference.

At stake in opposing ideas of nation and "manlike liberty" to the allegedly effeminizing powers of "poets' pastimes" are long-established convictions about the military function of the nobility, so that "before poets began to be in price our nation had set their hearts' delight upon action, and not imagination." By *our nation* Sidney here clearly means not the whole population but its noble elite, those entrusted with social, cultural, and political authority to represent and defend the community. In particular he means the warrior professionals charged with protecting the king's estate and entire realm, such members of the noble class to which he and his family aspired to belong. By its military function this class differentiated itself from the gentry, the rising bourgeoisie, and an increasingly strong central monarchy, but during the Tudor era, in the wake of the Hundred Years War and the civil wars of the fifteenth century, it found itself being pacified, demilitarized, and domesticated by being leveraged into a social class noted for its distinction of birth, culture, and self-regulation.[6] As an untitled gentleman at the end of this historical process, Sidney would resolutely imagine himself participating in military action, "rather doing things worthy to be written, than writing things fit to be done" (105).

At this impasse, untitled at a time when service to the nation was coming to be identified not with the military establishment but with the state bureaucracy, Sidney defends his work of writing, that is, his transformation of gnosis

into literature specifically associated with poetry. His argument turns on two claims: first, that there was no "before-time" without poetry, "since no memory is so ancient that hath not the precedent of poetry"; and, second, that any counterclaim breeds libel "against all learning" by opposing it to productive action (105). Words complement action; indeed, the pen is mightier than the sword, so that in his "unelected vocation" as a writer (73)—"unelected" because he imagines himself as devoted to poetry in lieu of other opportunities available to him in rustication at Wilton—Sidney is performing the work of his "nation." He is validating his membership in a ruling elite by justifying his career as a writer.

England, he declares in yet another gendered figuration, has become "so hard a stepmother to poets" that in the current climate of "overfaint quietness" (110)—a description that evokes his own inactivity at Wilton—the nation fails to honor its poets. The problem is not that England lacks good poets but that it prefers to reward "base men with servile wits." Sidney defines "base men" in a status-bound frame of reference that includes the ranks of "new" men entering the schools, the Inns of Court, and the lower echelons of government in hopes of professional advancement. These bourgeois aspirants to high degree now compete with noblemen who, in matters of poetic skill, should act "better content to suppress the outflowings of their wit, than, by publishing them, to be accounted knights of the same order" (111). Sidney responds by endorsing "at least to my opinion" the superiority of the "more sound style" of "smally learned courtiers" to the pallid style of its academic or professional and lower-class competitors (118). The language of court shaped by an accomplished elite, amateurs (in the etymological sense of *lovers*) in the various arts, overrides the utilitarian standards of narrow-minded experts, one-track practitioners, single-goal social climbers. It is not surprising to find as models for English style what George Puttenham in *The Art of Poetry* (1589) designates as "proper terms" and "cleanly conueyance" along with "sweet and stately measures."[7]

Puttenham complicates the issue by associating the first two terms with Thomas Wyatt and the last with the earl of Surrey, and his estimate fixed for centuries the judgment on both poets, "betweene whom I finde very litle difference" (60). This ranking strangely undoes a social distinction noted a generation earlier and held by Sidney. Richard Tottel's 1557 miscellany of *Songes and Sonnettes* had blatantly subordinated the lower-born Wyatt to the higher-born earl of Surrey, the son of England's leading peer and on his mother's side a descendant of Edward III.[8] Even though Tottel included twice as many of Wyatt's poems than Surrey's, he featured Surrey's name prominently in the vol-

ume's title, *Written by the Right Honorable Lord H. Haward Late Earl of Surrey and Others.*[9] His preface in turn characterizes "the honorable style of the noble Earl of Surrey" as a mark of distinction, elevating it above "the weightiness of the deep-witted Sir Thomas Wyatt." Tottel's goal had a nationalistic intent—to show that "our tong is able . . . to do as praiseworthy as the rest [of Europe's national languages]" (1.2)—and the result was to position the noble earl of Surrey at the forefront of sixteenth-century English literary history.

Sidney embraces Tottel's estimate but strikingly declines to mention Wyatt's name in *A Defence* when he includes Surrey's lyrics in his English national pantheon with *Troilus and Criseyde, Mirror for Magistrates,* and *Sheapherdes Calendar.* The terms in which he canonizes Surrey as one of the nation's premier poets along with Chaucer and Spenser reflect his aristocratic perspective as he credits his forerunners with "many things tasting of a noble birth, and worthy of a noble mind" (112). In *Astrophil and Stella,* however, we find that Sidney does exactly the opposite. He echoes the energy and dynamism of Wyatt's lyrics at the expense of Surrey's polish. It is as though Wyatt, twice imprisoned on murky charges of having undermined the king's interests (one of them relating to an alleged affair with Anne Boleyn) and Surrey, sent to the Tower and beheaded for quartering the king's arms at the very end of Henry VIII's reign, had become rival totemic figures for Philip Sidney.[10] Reminding him of his family pride, his elite identity, and his place in the English court, they awaken his ambivalence about court politics, his unrewarded service to the Crown, his frustrated interest in Penelope Rich, and his thwarted inheritance from the earl of Leicester.

Both Wyatt and Surrey, then, cast shadows that portended ill. If Wyatt's sometimes harried career inflicted pain as well as glory and Surrey's privileged existence ended on the block, a choice between them might seem nugatory. Striving to reclaim what had been lost or denied, Philip Sidney invests these precursors with exemplary value, but he would edit out of his own poetic practice the subversive, raw, and uncomfortable elements of Wyatt's model and replace them with the tractable, poised, more refined elements of Surrey's. Or so he might have wished to do. Despite his commendation of Surrey as one of England's preeminent national poets in *A Defence,* he more frequently in his own poetry echoes and reenacts the taboos associated with Wyatt.

The discrepancy betokens a crisis in social mobility during the early 1580s. In 1583 Sir Thomas Smith, secretary to Queen Elizabeth in 1571–77, published *De Republica Anglorum,* with its endorsement of "whosoever studieth the lawes of the realme, who studieth in the universities, who professeth liberall sciences,

and to be shorte, who can live idly and without manuall labor" as eligible for admission to the minor nobility exclusive of birthright.[11] Through "this maner of making gentlemen" Smith commends virtue, education, and public service as primary vehicles that justify advancement in rank, an idea articulated by humanist writers of an earlier generation. Sir John Ferne responded in his *Blazon of Gentry* (1586) with a categorical defense of bloodline and lineage as absolute prerequisites.[12] If industry, ingenuity, and even wealth alone were criteria, then pirates, thieves, and prostitutes would be noble.

High birth along with military and administrative service are crucial components, and Sidney agrees. He thoroughly values the claims of pedigree. In *A Defence* he dismisses More's *Utopia* with a backhanded compliment, praising the text for its skillful fiction but decrying its ideas "because where Sir Thomas More erred, it was the fault of the man" (86). More's spokesman, Raphael Hythloday, contends that the prerogatives of aristocratic birth undermine a commonwealth, and he argues instead for a consensual form of government which dissolves noble titles and redistributes inherited wealth. *Utopia* couches this program in the form of a legal contract negotiated between the ruler and the populace, a *consensus* enacted in the name of an egalitarian polity.[13] Sidney's *Arcadia* shows the chaos that ensues when, under the sanction of such legality that More might approve, the anointed king Basilius abdicates his sacred responsibility to rule and transmits his kingdom to Euarchus. In Philip Sidney's world an elevated birthright confers permanent duties as well as abiding obligations that safeguard the nation.

The claims of pedigree themselves invite disaster, of course, especially when they generate misguided loyalties and unsound allegiances, an inversion of attachments that are crucial to the formation of a national consciousness. The careers of Wyatt and Surrey exemplify such disaster as both men incurred high-level suspicions of Henry VIII. If Surrey possessed the formal titles that Sidney could only hope for, Wyatt displayed the verve that he might wish to emulate. The disparity between Wyatt's rank as a commoner who rose to knighthood by "commendable means" and Surrey's as a nobleman born into the peerage with royal ancestry was considerable. Their respective renditions of Petrarch's sonnet 140, "Amor, che nel penser mio vive et regna" 'Love, who lives and reigns in my thought,' together with various commentaries on the poem, illustrate the differences.

Petrarch's earliest commentators understand the poem's action as a challenge to socially variable rules of conduct in love:

> Onde Amor paventoso fugge al core,
> lasciando ogni suo impresa, et piange, et trema;
> ivi s'asconde, et non appar più fore.
> Che poss'io far, temendo il mio signore?
>
> Wherefore Love flees terrified to my heart, abandoning his every enterprise, and weeps and trembles; there he hides and no more appears outside. What can I do, when my lord is afraid?

Antonio da Tempo, for example, thinks that the speaker has transgressed bounds of decency in expressing his love. The poem shows "cio chel gli incontra con la sua donna quando talhor lui excede lusato non in gir a uederla" 'what happens with respect to his lady when he oversteps the customary bounds of seeing her' (e8^{v}–f1^{r}). Squarzafico repeats this idea and adds that for such a transgression the lover merits the beloved's censure "se lamore a questo li trasporta" 'if love brings him to this trespas' (D6^{v}). Vellutello imagines a similar situation "nelqual il Poe. ha dimostrato il repugnar che M.L. contra il suo sfrenato uoler facetia" 'in which the poet has shown the repugnance that Laura displayed against his unbridled will' (41^{r}). Sylvano da Venafro points to a defiant resolution. For him the sonnet shows the speaker's bold initiative in declaring his love to a reluctant Laura: "La sentenza del presente S. e ch'egli quelch uolta ardiua di plarle & cercar mercede & pieta alla pena sua" 'The meaning of the present sonnet is that he sometimes dared to speak with her and beg mercy and pity for his suffering' (cxxiiii^{r}). The speaker withdraws only in order to plot a new assault.

With variant emphases these commentators agree that the poem's speaker has acted with an unusual temerity that invites social rejection. Wyatt appears to have read the poem in this manner as a brash declaration of personal sovereignty.[14] Tottel nonetheless prefaces Wyatt's translation, "The long love that in my thought doth harbour," with a moralizing headnote that accents its speaker's squeamish retreat: "The lover for shamefastnesse hideth his desire within his faithfull hart" (Rollins, ed., 1.32). In fact, Wyatt accents the reverse with jagged trochaic rhythms, abrupt turns of phrase, and provincial Kentish verb endings in *-eth* which express his singular lack of shame or embarrassment about his low social status or cultural insensibility.[15] The personified "long love" encourages the speaker "with bold pretence" to display his "trust" (or confident expectation of being requited [OED sense 2]) until the beloved "with his hardinesse taketh displeasure." Her rebuke signals a breakdown in their relationship, as the lover ventures too far in his public display of "lust's negligence."

The biographical possibility of associating Wyatt's mistress with Anne Boleyn at a time when Henry VIII was beginning to notice her casts a penumbra of terror and intrigue over their relationship and a desperation born of the speaker's desire for a woman now even more unobtainable than Laura.[16] In the sestet Love flees "to the hartes forest," an expansive site suggesting uncharted territory and untamed wilderness:

> Wherewithal unto the hartes forest he fleeth,
> Leaving his enterprise with pain and cry,
> And there him hideth and not appeareth.

The speaker follows his lord into this darkness, expressing as in Petrarch's poem a loyalty to him rather than to his lady: "What may I do when my maister feareth?"[17] His pledge of faith to the conquering, though momentarily disabled, Love takes precedence over obedience to his riled beloved. Petrarch's poem ends in suspension with a double entendre about death as the *petite mort* of sexual climax, "chè bel fin fa chi ben amando more" 'for he makes a beautiful end who dies loving well,' a recall of the punning "laus in amore mori" 'to die in love is glory' of Propertius' elegy 2.1. Wyatt's translation ends upbeat, with an earnest statement of the speaker's fidelity to his master, "For good is the life, ending faithfully." The dramatic pause-laden four-stress rhythm replaces Petrarch's phosphorescent wit with a protestation of constancy, accenting the dactylic *faithfully* through its brisk off-rhyme with *live and die.*

Other commentators construe Petrarch's poem from a quite different perspective. Gesualdo, for example, regards the speaker as a victim of Laura's disdain: "Con turbata faccia guardaua" 'He looked upon her with a troubled face.' He will endure everything to win her, but she is implacably "sdegnando" 'disdainful,' and at every turn "portar li facea patientemente l'amoroso affanno" 'she has made him bear in sufferance his amorous pangs' (cxcviii^{r}). Bernardino Daniello likewise depicts Laura as the poem's aggressor. She is a Medusa who turns the hapless lover to stone when he casts his eyes upon her: "Come freddo marmo diueniua per la temenza poi" 'He turned into marble because of fear' (100^{r}). Petrarch loves her "grandemente e veracemente" 'greatly and truly' (100^{v}), but she responds with unremitting scorn.

Laura receives no little criticism from still other commentators, who judge her harshness as unfair. Fausto resolves the ambiguity of "temendo il signore," in which *signore* may be either subject or object of *temendo,* by deciding in favor of the former. The speaker has no hope for success "se colui in cui hauea qual che speranza ha tema di lei" 'if he in whom he placed such hope has fear

of her' (52^{v}). For Brucioli fear paralyzes the speaker: "Pel timore restaua di parlare" 'Through fear he refrained from speaking' (108^{r}). Castelvetro imagines that a friend has questioned Petrarch's behavior, to which he replies that "Amore, il quale regna nel suo cuore, lo 'nduce piu volte a dimostrar i suoi affanni" 'Love, which reigns in his heart, entices him to display his anguish.' It is a love as described "dalle parole d'Agathone nel Conuit" 'by the words of Agathon in Plato's *Symposium*' (272). The speaker is an unrequited hero, an honorable man domineered by a woman without pity, arriving finally at a state of philosophical acceptance. The earl of Surrey appears to have read the poem from such a perspective. His translation, "Love that doth raine and live within my thought," begins and wittily ends with the word *love,* circumscribing its speaker in a realm of honor and virtue.[18]

Unlike Wyatt's stark, unadorned, aggressively phallic Cupid, Surrey's is stately, aristocratic, and in control, elegantly "clad" in chivalric "armes" and accustomed to "raine" within the speaker's thought. Unlike Wyatt's lover, who places allegiance to his lord before loyalty to his lady, Surrey's has learned to subdue his "hote desire / With shamfast clooke," displaying a self-awareness beyond mere pragmatism. Upon the beloved's rebuke, Love retreats as a "cowarde," mindful of his "gylt" in having provoked her, while the speaker coolly asserts his own "fawtless" innocence:

> And cowarde love then to the hart apace
> Taketh his flight, where he doth lorke and playne
> His purpose lost, and dare not shew his face.
> For my lordes gylt thus fawtles byde I payine.

The beloved may have expressed a precipitate "yre" in rebuking the lover, but he curbs his own riposte. His composure and self-assurance, measured smoothly in regular iambics punctuated by an occasional trochee, lead calmly to the playful couplet that reinstates Petrarch's double entendre: "Yet from my Lorde shall not my foote remove. / Sweet is the death that taketh end by love." Energetic yet restrained, Surrey models the dry-eyed detachment of a regnant courtly elite. It is easy to understand why Philip Sidney figured him high in his national pantheon.[19]

Sidney might have aspired to Surrey's template in theory, but in practice throughout *Astrophil and Stella* he more frequently evokes Wyatt's gritty example. Surrey himself had praised Wyatt as "a worthy guide to brynge / Our Englysshe youth, by travayle unto fame" (Elegy to Wyatt, "Wyat resteth here"), and Sidney's persona would concur. Recalling from Wyatt's "Mine own

John Poyntz," the accusatory "I am not he such eloquence to boast / To make the crow singing as the swan," Astrophil ridicules in sonnet 3 both "daintie wits" in the Continental fashion and "*Pindares* apes" in the classical mode.[20] He hankers for an opportunity in the public arena to clothe himself in valor that will repay "Nature's rent, / Which unto it by birthright I do ow" (sonnet 18), to earn Stella's acceptance by fulfilling his yet unfulfilled "great promise" (sonnet 21). His penultimate sonnet plots to win Stella back through heroic exploits, "since thou so right a Princesse art" (sonnet 107). He accordingly asks her "as a Queene" to assign him to some "great cause," replacing her in his imagination with the reigning monarch, whose state he would serve.[21] In a reversion to Petrarch's sonnet 140, in which the lover takes on Love's shame as he flees from his sovereign, Astrophil hopes that his misdeeds may not damage Stella's reputation: "On servants shame oft Maisters blame doth sit." But, having fallen "under the banner of unresistible love" derided in *A Defence* (116–17), he could scarcely persuade a reader that he is ready to succeed in any public, let alone nationally prominent, endeavor. He parades his *noblesse* without the slightest trace of *oblige.*

Mary Wroth's speaker would regard such masculine heroics with a detached judgment. As a beloved aware of Amphilanthus's infidelity to her, Pamphilia has been on the receiving end of his "fiery speeches" and "swelling phrases" in clear knowledge of the difference between "lovers' writings" and a genuine "forcibleness or *energia*" of lived emotion (*Defence* 117). As a queen, too, she has been on the receiving end of her subjects' devotion to her, and she knows full well the uncertainty of their dedication as well as the unpredictability of their achievement. As a woman, finally, she is on the receiving end of gendered expectations about the sexual division of labor which denies her the prowess of Sidney's, Wyatt's, or Surrey's speakers. One consequence is her heightened emphasis on private virtues such as prudence, wisdom, sexual integrity, and inner spirituality to compensate for her limited access to public heroics.[22]

Sonnet 24, first series (P27), "Once did I heere an aged father say," presents this consequence as an apology for the negative poetics of Philip Sidney's *Defence.* Recalling the dialogue in Petrarch's sonnet 262, "Cara la vita, e dopo lei mi pare / Vera honestà, che 'n bella donna sia" 'Life is most dear, it seems to me, and after that, true virtue in a beautiful woman,' Wroth's poem registers a father's advice to an adult son about jealousy and constancy in love:

> My Sonn sayd hee, behold thy father, gray,
> I once had as thou hast, fresh tender years,

> And like thee sported, destitude of feares
> Butt my young faults made mee too soone decay.

In nearly every important aspect Wroth reverses the rhetorical strategies of her model. Petrarch narrates a dialogue between an older woman, respectfully called "madre mia" 'my mother,' and a younger one, presumably Laura. Wroth's poem switches the gender and allows only the father to speak directly. Petrarch's poem offers the elder woman's opinion about the merits of expedience in response to rape and then allows the younger woman to articulate an opposing view. Wroth's poem delivers the father's advice with profound ambiguity about its outcome.

As Petrarch's commentators show, the model itself displays uncertainty. The identity of the *madre* remains unclear. No commentator assumes that she is Laura's parent, but, as Antonio da Tempo points out, the word might function as an honorific for any woman of appropriate age or rank: "Appella la madre in signo de honor reuerentia & de amore" 'He uses *madre* as a term of honor, reverence, and affection' (g viii^{r}). Fausto remarks that she may have been Laura's elder sister: "Pensano alcuni che fosse fatto questo so. per vna sorella di L. qual era di dishonesta vita" 'Some think that this sonnet was composed for one of Laura's sisters who had fallen into a life of dishonor' (97^{r}). Nor does the text confirm that Laura is her interlocutor. Antonio, Squarzafico, Sylvano, and Brucioli assume that Petrarch is addressing the older woman. Daniello imagines that he is engaging in a philosophical dialogue with several women, "parlandosi in vna camera fra certe Matrone della vita, e dell' honestà: . . . Et essendo da vna di quelle Matrone pregato il Poe. ch' egli anchora volesse dire sopra di ciò il parer suo" 'discoursing about life and honor among certain ladies in a chamber; . . . and being asked by one of them what he would still like to say about her way of thinking" (154^{r}).

Vellutello, Fausto, Gesualdo, and Castelvetro hear Laura's corrective voice in the admonitory "L'ordine volgi" 'You reverse the order,' but some hear it more clearly than others. Castelvetro construes the rest of the poem as Laura's refutation: "I primi due versi s'introducono per parole d'vna donna attempata. . . . glialtri sono parole di L. tenente il contrario" 'The first two lines begin with the words of an elderly woman. . . . The rest are Laura's words asserting the contrary' (434). But the poem's ambiguity goes beyond the identification of its speaker to question the legitimacy of his or her ethical teaching. Vellutello resurrects a controversy among moral philosophers about Lucretia's suicide.[23] From a purely rational point of view, life is more sacred than virtue or honor;

the latter acquire value in the light of further speculation: "Tutti i morali philosophi . . . diranno, la morte di Lucretia non essere stata necessaria, non hauendo ella con l'animo peccato" 'All the moral philosophers will say that Lucretia's death was unnecessary, since she did not sin in spirit" (199ᵛ). For Gesualdo, Laura emerges as the supreme example of virtue, one that makes Lucretia's act pale by comparison: "Tacitamente lauda M.L. in cui era giunta honesta con leggiadria" 'Implicitly he is praising Laura, in whom honor is accompanied by gracefulness.' The commentator then analyzes Laura's reproof step by step and traces its claims "ab opposito consequentis ad oppositum antecedentis" 'from the opposite of consequent to the opposite of antecedent' (cccivᵛ).

Readers of Wroth's poem who apply this logical rigor to its argument will uncover flawed premises and false conclusions. According to the father, his own crisis occurred in a moment of misgiving, fueled by jealousy, which led him to doubt his beloved's fidelity. As he explains his unease, he evokes "fear'd" with its older sense of *doubt:* "Love once I did, and like thee fear'd my love." An off-rhyme of *Jealousy/liberty* signals confusion:

> Led by the hateful thread of Jealousy,
> Striving to keepe, I lost my liberty,
> And gain'd my griefe which still my sorrowes move.

As the father confesses his mistake, he denies any error in perception. The contrast between *keepe* and *lost* suggests instead some deliberate act of transgression. If one invents a scenario, it may run like this: the man has doubted his beloved's fidelity; whether to retaliate or simply to get on with his life, he transfers his affections to another woman; when the first woman sees that he has violated his fidelity, she suspends hers and takes a new lover; in consequence both suffer.

This father retails a comedy of errors, but he neglects to specify the crucial event that prevents his return to the status quo. The missing link in his narrative logic obscures his deliberative role and diminishes his reliability as a teacher or guide. His conclusion wobbles, shot through with unexamined assumptions: "In time shunn this; To love is noe offence / Butt doubt in youth, in age breeds penitence." Does all love give "noe offence"? Is all "doubt" unwarranted in youth? In his own case did "penitence" in old age arise only from doubt, or does it atone for some unmentioned wrong? If the son could respond to his father, what would he say? Wroth's sonnet here plays with fanciful evasions of men's logic. It parodies forms of argument taught, discussed, practiced, and exemplified in gender-restricted educational institutions, uni-

versities, and Inns of Court that speak on behalf of the nation.[24] Applied to amatory situations and addressed to jealous beloveds, this logic shores up the ego of men who think it unavailable to untutored women. Applied to confederated loyalties among men of power and prominence, it tests the bonds of allegiance which promote social cohesion. It is symptomatic of further intellectual obstacles to securing an effective sense of national cohesion.

Philip Sidney had likewise perceived the affinity of such logic to sophistry and political regression, and he satirized it broadly in such poems as sonnet 63 of *Astrophil and Stella,* "O grammer rules." There the young man who plies his beloved with specious rhetoric is using a verbal talent that he has developed to shape a public career based upon rhetorical skills. Part of the joke is that the nobility to which Astrophil pretends needs no academic credentials to safeguard its status. Its members could safely leave oratory to opportunistic lawyers employed to defend them. That those outside of Astrophil's charmed circle appreciated the joke appears evident in annotations upon *Astrophil and Stella* written by Brian Twyne (1579–1644), a reader of Greek at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Twyne draws attention to Astrophil's misuse of "grammer rules" in which "2 negatiues make an affirmatiue," suggesting how well-educated, nonaristocratic readers might have criticized the speaker's sophistry.[25] Certainly it requires little technical training to detect Astrophil's besetting use of *occupatio,* the figure of seeming to pass over or deny what one in fact states directly. "Fool," Astrophil's muse addresses him in sonnet 1, and "fool" is exactly what he is.[26]

The logic of Pamphilia's father and son is an imprecise tool for assessing complex moral reality. Its results are only as adequate or inadequate as the goals of those who use it. Wroth's poem implies a critique of the class-bound suppositions that govern a male discourse about love. It may be the discourse of her uncle's Astrophil or her father's Rosis in pursuit of a resonant public voice, but it is not the discourse of Pamphilia, who rules her nation as its queen. Petrarchan conventions provide a holding pattern that sustains the forenamed in a reciprocal network of themes and motifs, figures and tropes, arguments and counterarguments. It sustains a sense of personal identity which Wroth continually reassesses and reconstructs as a component of national identity. Knowing full well that her uncle wanted his readers to perceive Astrophil as errant, Wroth reproduces a flawed logic in the dialogue of father and son in sonnet 24. To evaluate their speech she activates the techniques urged in *A Defence* to uncover not "what is or is not, but what should or should not be" (102), shifting a negative apology into a richly positive poetry.

The deeper dimension that Wroth confers upon her characters in *Urania* evolves from their rank and status as members of royal families. Impulsive some of them are and prone to gendered weaknesses of male egotism and female disconsolation, but each is or is poised to be the monarch of an established kingdom. Their destinies encapsulate Wroth's sense of the territorial state and its capacity for a national identity. As daughter of the king of Morea, for example, Pamphilia has been raised in Peloponnesian Greece, but she is designated as heiress of her uncle's kingdom of Pamphilia in southwestern Turkey "and therefore bore that name likewise given by him" (First Part 100). The latter became king by will of the people after winning them from "the subjection of Tyrants," illustrating Sidneian convictions about the legitimacy of ending tyrannical rule. But his election "in requitall whereof the people chose him their King" amounts to no endorsement of monarchical rule by consensus. Necessitated by the lack of any legitimate heir to the throne, it favors dynastic supremacy over vaguely Calvinistic or republican forms of rule by magistracy or vote. The Pamphilians consequently empower their heirless king, because "he never marryed," to chose his successor "as they have given him leave." He appoints his niece to succeed him lest the choice "had else falne to them againe" (145).

Pamphilia exemplifies the strong monarch that Philip Sidney and the Leicester circle urged Elizabeth I to be when they dissuaded her from marrying the duke of Anjou. Pamphilia rejects the suit of Leandrus on grounds that she "had once married her before, which was to the Kingdome of Pamphilia, from which Husband shee could not be divorced, nor ever would have other" (First Part 262). Echoing Elizabeth I's 1559 letter to the House of Commons that "I am already bound unto a husband, which is England" and her declaration that she would appoint a successor "more beneficial to the realm than such offspring as may come of me," Pamphilia averts the peril that might result from hereditary chance.[27] Her great historical prototype is once again Elizabeth I, who chose James I as royal successor.[28]

In a kind of stereoscopic vision Wroth identifies Pamphilia with England and England's Virgin Queen, even though the historical conditions for Elizabeth's kind of rule had long since passed. One of the most striking instances of this identification between character and kingdom occurs in sonnet 6, second series (P68), "My paine, still smother'd in my grieved brest," incorporating the Petrarchan topos of the storm-tossed ship of state.[29] Pamphilia compares her amatory distress to being caught in the treacherous Goodwin Sands off the coast of Kent:

> Like to a ship, on Goodwines cast by wind
> The more she strives, more deepe in sand is prest
> Till she bee lost. So am I, in this kind
> Sunk, and devour'd, and swallow'd by unrest.

Pamphilia's specificity of place (the Goodwin Sands) gives witness to a sense of mapping and concrete spatial reference which subtends the increased mobility and political unification of the early seventeenth century.[30] Although Pamphilia does not set foot in England, her attention to affairs in far-off kingdoms of the Aegean occupies her imagination just as Amphilanthus's attention to affairs in western and eastern Europe occupies his imagination. The latter has been born heir to the Kingdom of Naples, has been subsequently appointed king of the Romans because of his valor, and is finally elected Holy Roman Emperor, exercising power to unite the ruling houses of Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Macedonia, Tartaria, Epirus, Phrygia, Slavonia, Negroponte, Florence, Venice, Sicily, Brunswick, Wurttemberg, Burgundy, and Savoy, "and with the best reason, for he was the most worthy, and famous that ever reign'd over them" (First Part 463).[31] Between them Pamphilia and Amphilanthus come to rule over eastern Europe and Asia Minor.

The romance locale of *Urania* conveys a seventeenth-century Briton's-eye view of the world to the east. This view is imaginatively congruent with contemporary accounts of such broader locales in the travel narratives of George Sandys's *A Relation of a Journey* (1615) and Fynes Moryson's *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell* (1617). Wroth's positioning of the rock at St. Maura on the Ionian island of Leucadia, "a rocke which lies just against it towards *Cephalonia*" (First Part 141), for example, directly echoes Sandys's: "a white rocke which lyeth before it, towards *Cephalonia.*"[32] Representations of geographical space, national character, and political distinctiveness such as those in Sandys and Moryson likewise inform Wroth's narrative.[33] The stereotypes of national ethos in these accounts readily merge with romance topoi in the action of *Urania,* especially in exploits associated with Amphilanthus.

Amphilanthus's captivity in England allows for a satiric interlude designed to sharpen the national sentiment of its English readers near the end of the fiction. Here the prince of Venice and the dukes of Savoy and Florence arrive in England to search for the missing hero. They set anchor at Dover, identified as "the faire Rocks of Brittany, anciently called Albion; but by happinesse after many misfortunes againe called Brittany" (First Part 627). This renaming of Albion as "Brittany" accords with James's efforts to unite England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland under the composite ancestral name of "Britain."[34] It em-

bellishes the nationalist myth of early settlement by the Trojan Brute as well as the ancient migration of Celtic Bretons from the Rhine basin across western Europe into southern England, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland. Perhaps most conspicuously, it registers the mixed ethnic identity of Britain and, in retrospect, the merely fractional part played by England and its Anglo-Saxon forebears in shaping the composite nation.[35] Wroth's description of this Brittany notes its bracing air, "and that in greatest bounty," its generally sparse rural habitation in a landscape "stony, wooddy, rocky, and as odde as could bee," its "faire" though apparently "poore" towns (627), its expansive forests and communal lands with sheep "in aboundance, and some Cattle" (630), and "the bravery, and sumptuousnesse" of London (653). But it also defines "this charming Countrey" as a site of aberrant action (654). The story recounts the "unmanerly" reception of "haughty" foreigners upon their arrival at a rural inn, "a second or rather a perfect Hell" crowded with drunken knights and quarrelling squires (628–29), and it leads to the allegory of Amphilanthus's entrapment in the Hell of Deceit, figuring the abuse of imagination which holds its self-pleasing grip upon the monarch of Pamphilia's affection.[36]

Fanciful as this narrative is, it enables readers to glimpse the geopolitical diversity of Europe and the Middle East and to assess the uniqueness of England in this world.[37] Because *Urania* is a romance fiction, its amatory entanglements prevail over dynastic relationships. It is as though Wroth's protagonists see themselves as anguished lovers first, baffled and tormented by the pangs of love, and as ascendant monarchs second, human beings with feet of clay dressed in robes of state which barely compensate for their doubts and insecurities. Their crowns appear as inherited artifacts scarcely differentiating them from lesser mortals, who behave in similar ways under the rule of Love. The lessons of Sidney's *Defence* travel full circle as "our poet" becomes "of all sciences . . . the monarch": "For he doth not only shew the way, but giveth so sweet a prospect unto the way as will entice any man to enter into it" (First Part 92). Here Petrarch and Petrarchism, especially Petrarchism as elaborated in the commentaries, provide the keys to spiritual renewal among Wroth's beleaguered heroes and heroines as their aristocratic impulses guide them to virtue. Internal merit justifies their rank and status, palliating their worldly ambition with spiritual refinement. With this assessment Wroth's defensive uncle could surely agree. If his literary production aimed implicitly toward that goal, hers makes it explicit as an apology for her family's undeniable achievements.

11 *Prosthetic Gods*

The Liberties of Astrophil and Pamphilia

Henry Sidney's advancement toward title in the reign of Henry VIII reached a double climax with his daughter Mary's marriage to the earl of Pembroke in Elizabeth's reign and his son Robert's accession to the nobility in James' reign. Its success might seem the fulfillment of a fairy-tale dream, except that frustrations mark the way. Felt most keenly in the transitional generation of Mary and Robert, these frustrations beget a strong malaise. The jagged evolution of social categories in early-seventeenth-century England further complicates the family's ambivalence. When the linkage of aristocracy to wealth and status rather than to a warrior professionalism took root during James I's reign, earlier definitions of rank became blurred.[1] A spirit of commercialism had befallen England's urban population, bringing prosperity to the gentry and bourgeoisie and positioning them for economic competition with the titled nobility. The great recorder of this transformation was Ben Jonson, frequenter of the Sidneys at Penshurst and Wilton. In alternating currents of satire and detachment, complicity and involvement, he chronicled the rise of town and country gentlefolk and wealthy bourgeoisie to prominence in the nation's expansive hierarchy, using the Sidney family as a classical point of reference in poems on that topic.[2]

Jonson's "To Penshurst" is a celebrated example. Here the poet disclaims that Robert Sidney's estate was "built to envious show, / Of touch, or marble" (1–2), as it would have been by the nouveau riche; it instead rejoices "in better markes" of aristocratic virtue and honor (7).[3] As the speaker weaves a seamless, almost invisible web of pentameter couplet rhymes, so he makes the immense human

labor required to build Penshurst seem effortless, as though the edifices of poem and building were "rear'd with no mans ruine, no mans grone" (46).[4] Jonson, a bricklayer's stepson, fantasizes a rise in his own status as he identifies with his patrons, imaging that in the dining hall no waiter "doth my gluttony envy: / But gives me what I call, and lets me eate" (68–69). So complete is this fantasy that he addresses Penshurst "as if thou, then, wert mine, or I raign'd here" (74).[5]

The poet's assertion of command over this site proclaims a *nobilitas* in the national imaginary that would please Mary Wroth. Following "To Penshurst" in his carefully arranged collection *The Forrest* (1616) Jonson dedicates a poem to her husband, "To Sir Robert Wroth," which depicts a salubrious mingling of the nation's nobility and its rustic workers (but not mercantile bourgeoisie) in bonds of loyalty and allegiance. Here Sir Robert's zest for hunting brings him into productive contact with "the rout of rurall folke" who labor on his estate (53). Receiving them with "welcome grace," Lady Wroth entertains them in ancestral halls where now "the great *Heroes,* of her race, / Sit mixt with losse of state, or reverence" (56–57). The Sidney family's "losse" implied in its mingling with lowly rustics evokes a corresponding gain in its achieving not only real title but also a high moral ground where "freedome doth with degree dispense" (58).

Like the Sidneys, Jonson reached into the canons of England's literary history to gather and assimilate materials for his literary production.[6] As though to proclaim this connection, he dedicated his 1612 *Epigrammes* to William Herbert, declaring these classical poems "the ripest of my studies" (3).[7] And, as though to acknowledge Herbert's relationship with Wroth, he addressed successive epigrams to each. Epigram 102 praises Herbert's *noblêsse,* which "keeps one stature still, / And one true posture" against the "ambition, faction, pride" of the times. Epigram 103 praises in Wroth "but the twi-light of your sprite" which would make her known "to be a *Sydney,* though un-named." Epigram 105, framed by poems addressed to the Herbert family (Susan de Vere, countess of Montgomery, in 104 and Sir Edward Herbert in 106), praises Wroth as a model from which to reconstruct the form of classical virtue "had all antiquitie beene lost." She figures at once a text that some might imitate ("There's none so dull, that for your stile would aske") and a topic that others might pursue ("So are you *Natures Index,* and restore / I' your selfe, all treasure lost of th'age before"). She is the material embodiment of a social ethic and moral aesthetic recovered from England's now distant past.[8] In Jonson's and Wroth's day London was seen as embodying the best that the nation had to offer, a concentration of its wealth in the material as well as spiritual, cultural, intel-

lectual senses, so that it prefigured synecdochally the entire nation of which it was a part.

Ben Jonson avoided the Petrarchan model in his own writing, except for some satiric uses in such plays as *Epicoene.*[9] The single example of the sonnet form in his collected verse, poem 30 of *Under-wood* (gathered in 1631 and published in 1640–41), appropriately addresses Wroth. Here Jonson plays mischievously with the conventions of Petrarchism even as he disparages them. The speaker records his experience of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* with the neologism *exscribe,* conveying the physical act of copying out a manuscript but also suggesting "to imitate the writing of another." Not only does this act allow Jonson the illusion of possessing Wroth's poetry in its material form, but it also enables him to process and absorb the latter, enhancing his perception of its virtues.[10] Fittingly, the experience prompts him to write a sonnet, though with the characteristic Jonsonian twist of imposing his own poetic rhythms in the conspicuously hypermetrical "feminine" rhymes of *shew it* and *poet:*

> I that have beene a lover, and could shew it,
> Though not in these, in rithmes not wholly dumbe,
> Since I exscribe your Sonnets, am become
> A better lover, and much better Poet.

The poem demonstrates Jonson's art of gathering and transformation while ingesting Wroth's delight in Petrarchan form. Jonson had earlier dedicated to her his quarto printing of *The Alchemist* (1612), evidently trusting that she would appreciate its satire on the commercialization of London's middle classes, about as far from courtly Petrarchism as one might imagine. Her enjoyment of it affords one more confirmation of her aversion to the values embraced by England's bourgeoisie.

Wroth laid claim to the Sidneys' literary assets, and she used them to proclaim her aristocratic flight from the populous urban marketplace that Jonson derided. Her departure from this milieu is complicated, however, by feelings of ambivalence toward her immediate family. Her father, though elevated to the nation's peerage, hardly represents the family's most talented member. Its ideal remains Philip Sidney. His aspirations embody everything that an earlier generation thought unattainable and a later generation took for granted. In terms that Freud describes in *Civilization and Its Discontents,* ancestors like Philip Sidney function as gods who represent "cultural ideals." The problem begins when his descendants might wish to seem gods themselves, but, as Freud points out, they attain their goals "not completely; in some respects, not

at all, in others only half way" (*Works* 21.91). The result for this generation is a sense of inferiority and insufficiency. The heir feels like "a kind of prosthetic God," propped up by an inheritance that is not fully his or her own: "When he puts on all his auxiliary organs he is truly magnificent; but those organs have not grown on him and they still give him much trouble at times" (21.92). These prosthetic devices are now construed largely as infringements upon the heir's liberty.

The trappings of caste and class, tangible displays of power and wealth, prestige and entitlement, constitute the most visible sorts of prosthetic device associated with the nation's elite families. Mary Wroth routinely devalued most of these trappings, but, following in the mold of her aunt and uncle, she greatly esteemed her literary and rhetorical education as the mark of her commitment to learning. The family had in fact staked a great deal on the latter ever since Henry Sidney began assembling a serious library in the 1560s. A recently recovered seventeenth-century catalog of the Penshurst library suggests that Henry and his descendants seem consistently to have favored books of law, history, and current events over every other type, reflecting their preoccupation with the nation's affairs of state, the political advancement of their own interests, and matters of supreme public consequence.[11] In October 1580 Philip defended this preoccupation in a letter to Robert urging him to study history more seriously than other academic disciplines because "the Historian makes himself a discourse for profite and an Orator, yea, a Poet sometimes for Ornament," subsuming into his writing the work of "the Divine . . . the Lawyer . . . a Naturall Philosopher . . . and a moral Philosopher."[12] Such habits of reading would prepare its practitioners for roles of leadership in adapting to a modernized world.

The text that would provide the major ground for application and recombination was the Bible. Mary Sidney, as we have seen, devoted a great part of her literary activity to translating Psalms, while women who wrote on scriptural themes include Anne Askew, Anne Lok, and Anne Collins. Among Wroth's contemporaries most important was Aemelia Lanyer (1569–1654), a daughter of Elizabeth I's Venetian court musician, Baptista Bassano, and like Wroth no stranger to sexual impropriety.[13] In 1611 Lanyer was one of the first women in England to see her own work through the press when she published *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*.[14] Her poem, a biblical narrative about Jesus' Passion and Resurrection in 230 rhyme royale stanzas, is framed by dedicatory poems that press the old conventions of Petrarchism to register the new pulse of seventeenth-century England before abandoning them altogether.[15]

With its bold emotional emphasis on the lamentations of Mary and the female saints, the *Salve Deus* seems out of step with increasingly austere Calvinist leanings that disparaged such sentiment.[16] Addressing elite women who might serve as possible patrons for this poetry, Lanyer confronted the social differences that complicate their putatively shared ideals.[17] In "To the Ladie *Katherine* Countesse of Suffolke," for example, she cites the Petrarchan model as a specific instance of elite court poetry against which hers represents Christ as "a Lover much more true / Than ever was since first the world began" (52–53).[18] In "To the Queenes most Excellent Majestie" she depicts herself as "clos'd up in Sorrowes Cell, / Since great Elizaes favour blest my youth" (109–10), a comparison indicting the Jacobean court for having become a snobbish preserve. In "The Authors Dreame to the Ladie *Marie*" she addresses Mary Sidney, whose translated Psalms are "holy Sonnets" (121), at once noting the distance between herself "here on earth" and Sidney now "in the heav'ns above" (154). Lanyer's poetic efforts as native "hony in the meanest flowres" contrast sharply with Mary Sidney's, figured as luxury "sugar" imported from New World colonies, "more finer, higher priz'd" (196–98), but both aspire to the sweetness formerly exemplified by Petrarch's candied sonnets and tempered style.

The patron whom Lanyer sought most to attract was Margaret Clifford, countess dowager of Cumberland, and in poems addressed to her daughter Lanyer figures a series of roles that women might play in imagining England as a nation and in formulating new expressions of national sentiment. In "To the Ladie *Anne,* Countesse of Dorset" she tries to efface the social disparities in their rank with the claim that "God makes both even, the Cottage with the Throne" (19). Such women might show the way to an equitable society built upon loyalty and trust, in which bonds of allegiance unite members unknown to one another but sharing crisscrossed patterns of tacit affection and affiliation in interlocking, interpenetrating layers of shared community. In the topographic poem celebrating the royal manor associated with the Cliffords, the "Description of Cooke-ham," Lanyer mourns her absence from this site "where I first obtain'd / Grace from that Grace where perfit Grace remain'd" (1–2), and from the person of Anne, whose marriage to the earl of Dorset has transported her far away:

> Unconstant Fortune, thou art most too blame,
> Who casts us downe into so Lowe a frame:
> Where our great friends we cannot daily see.
> (103–6)

In this telling ambiguity of *Fortune* as "fate, lot in life" but also as "portion of wealth or worldly prosperity," Lanyer registers upon upper-class women the emotional toll of their social mobility when they leave their families of origin to wed (usually older) men in marriages arranged to serve the economic interests of their kin.[19] With them, however, they transport at least a sense of their local or regional identities, uniting them with those of their husbands in sometimes distant locales. And, in raising their own families upon this hybrid space, they would become links in a network of translocal, supraregional identity.

In Lanyer's view the exogamic experience of these women becomes a paradigm for a newly defined, generically transportable brand of national sentiment. One scriptural prototype for such women is Ruth, a widow who fuses her own identity with that of her spousal family and in exchange acquires a new form of identity. Ruth, the foreigner, absorbs radical Otherness into her embrace of an adoptive community and thus models a role that exogamic wives and mothers adopt in their marital and family arrangements.[20] Lanyer's gallery of potential patrons acknowledges this condition of life for upper-class women, figuring it as emblematic of a commutative national sentiment. Such a sentiment would increasingly call upon women—and men—to commit themselves to supraregional loyalties that transcend narrowly provincial contexts and fuel the hybrid identity of the nation.

In Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* a powerful example of such secularized scriptural modeling concerns the meaning of the word *liberty,* used by Paul in 2 Corinthians 3.17 ("Where is the spirit of God, there is liberty [Koine *eleutheria,* Vulgate *libertas*]) to designate a freedom from bondage to sin granted by divine patrimony but also used in early-seventeenth-century English in a range of meaning from ordinary "freedom to act" (OED sense 3) to opprobrious "licence or licentious behavior" (OED sense 5) to the sense of "an exceptional right or privilege granted to a subject by the sovereign" (OED sense 7). *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* stages a conflict among these meanings in the laments of their Petrarchan lovers. Wroth's speaker, the queen of Morea, finds herself on the receiving end of Petrarchan declarations wrought by an imperfect and disappointing man, the king of Naples and soon-to-be Holy Roman Emperor. Mistreatment drives her to defense mechanisms with potential consequences for the nation that she rules.

Sonnet 14, first series (P16), "Am I thus conquer'd? have I lost the powers," exemplifies the distractions to which Pamphilia is led, the evasions that she may practice in dealing with them, and the insight that she might gain in a wider social, psychological, and theological context.[21] The poem recalls sonnet

47 of *Astrophil and Stella,* "What, have I thus betrayed my libertie?" which itself echoes Petrarch's concern with *libertà* (liberty) in sonnets 95, 96, 97, and 169. The nexus among various meanings in the word *liberty* is its etymology from the collective noun *liberi, liber(or)um* (offspring), which designates children of the patrician class, born with the right to inherit titles and estates from their ancestors and with the duty of their parents to ensure such transmission.[22] Even the sovereign is constrained to respect their rights to familial inheritances just as God grants His own designated *liberi* freedom from bondage to sin.

Wroth's and Sidney's poems follow similar trajectories. Pamphilia initially questions whether she has lost her freedom to resist Love's conquest of her will: "Am I thus conquer'd? have I lost the powers / That to withstand, which joy's to ruin mee?" Although in a pivotal couplet she forcefully rejects Love's domination—"Why should wee not loves purblind charmes resist? / Must wee bee servile, doing what hee list?"—she nonetheless accedes to Love in the poem's final lines: "Butt O my hurt, makes my lost hart confess / I love, and must: so farwell libertie." Astrophil defiantly questions whether he has lost his freedom: "What, have I thus betrayed my libertie?" His initial inquiry raises self-doubt about his very rank and status: "Can those black beames such burning markes engrave / In my free side? or am I borne a slave, / Whose necke becomes such yoke of tyranny?" Summoning Virtue in the sestet, "Vertue, awake!" Astrophil rouses himself to reject Stella's seductive allure. At that very moment she appears before him. On the verge of renouncing her, he suddenly halts. In a hilarious reversal one glimpse of her eyes paralyzes him:

> Let her go. Soft, but here she comes. Go to,
> Unkind, I love you not: O me, that eye
> Doth make my heart give to my tongue the lie.

In each poem, then, the speaker surrenders to Love. The difference is that Pamphilia does so through a conscious act of the will ("So farewell Liberty"), while Astrophil does so in an unconscious, involuntary moment of weakness ("O me"). Pamphilia hands herself over to a sublime love, while Astrophil slips on the banana peel of lust.

Astrophil's weakness rehearses a distinct line of inquiry in sixteenth-century commentaries on Petrarch's sonnet 97, "Ahi bella libertà, come tu m'ài, / Partendoti da me" 'Ah sweet liberty, how by departing from me,' a poem whose tortured metrics forecast Sidney's dramatic rhythms. The dominant effect of Petrarch's verse occurs through a higher-than-usual frequency of midline *tronco* stresses on the final syllables at the hiatus of some lines ("Ahi bella lib-

ertà," "partendoti da me") and dieresis or the separation of adjunct vowels in the final syllables of other lines ("come tu m'ài," "io non guerro mai"). The result conveys sharp agitation. Sidney's effects, by contrast, are comic, whether registered by jerky iambs ("I may, I must, I can, I will, I do") or by breath-pausing enjambment ("go to, / Unkind, I love you not"). Some commentators on Petrarch's model construe the speaker's lost *libertà* in the context of scriptural opposition between freedom of the spirit and bondage to the flesh, as in St. Paul's 2 Corinthians 3.17, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Gesualdo imparts a Neoplatonic turn to his discussion by paraphrasing the octave's final lines so that "a uedere beltà celeste & a schifare ogni cosa men bella" 'to see heavenly beauty and to despise everything less beautiful' are qualities imputed "al Platonico & al uero amante" 'to the Platonic and to the true lover' (CXXIX^{r}). Castelvetro adds that Laura is a "diuina cosa" 'divine being' and that, like the mythic Acteon, mere mortals such as Petrarch "non vegga cosa diuina senza danno" 'do not behold a divine being without being harmed' (184).

When Bernardino Daniello comments upon the topos, he veers notably away from moral or theological issues and refers instead to classical precedent. Shifting the site of Petrarch's concerns to the social and political sphere, he identifies *bella libertà* as an echo from Virgil's *Aeneid* 6.820–23. These lines evoke the historical struggle between Rome's elite families and its tyrannical kingship, resulting in the birth of the republic as an oligarchy, ruled by patrician magistrates in the interests of great landowners. Here Anchises prophesies the goal of Junius Brutus, who wrested the imperium from his uncle Tarquin in 509 B.C.E. and restored it to the aristocracy, "pulchra pro libertate" 'for fair freedom's sake' (6.821).[23] So strong was Brutus' *amor patriae* (*Aeneid* 6.823)—a love not of nation or res publica or "fatherland" in any extended sense but of his own distinct lineage and aristocratic patrimony, his *patria* in the sense of patrilinear family connections—that as Roman consul he later sentenced to death his own sons for conspiring to restore the exiled king: "natosque pater nova bella moventis / ad poenam pulchra pro libertate vocabit" 'when his sons stir up new war, the father, for fair freedom's sake, shall call them to their doom' (6.820–21). It is as though the pious *amor patris* that motivated Aeneas' journey to the underworld had morphed into a monstrous *amor patriae* (6.133).

Particularizing *libertas* in its etymological derivation from *liberi* as the privilege of a noble family to transmit its inheritance to legitimate offspring and thus to manage its own affairs, Daniello applies it to Petrarch's concern with his poetic patrimony. The speaker worries that his deference to Laura has undone his *libertà* as a poet, his privilege and responsibility, that is, to transmit a

poetic inheritance from classical antiquity to the present. Perhaps it may even impel him to abandon his major *liber* (book) as a poet, his epic about the ancient republic's finest hour in the Punic Wars. *Amor* inverts his poetic preoccupation with *Roma,* an inversion measured in the opening of the last tercet (echoing the word-within-words of *mia morte* associating *amor* [love] with a kind of *morte* [death] in the preceding tercet) and in the figuration of *pie* (feet) for metrics and *man* (hands) for writing:

> Amor in altra parte non mi sprona,
> né i pie' sanno altra via, né le man come
> lodar si possa in carte altra persona.

Love does not spur me anywhere else, nor do my feet know any other road, nor do my hands know how on paper any other person can be praised.

Laura's tyranny deprives future generations of one sort of poetic patrimony while endowing it with another in the form of the Petrarchan lyric.

Daniello's gloss anticipates the patrimonial contexts of both *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* and *Astrophil and Stella.* It summons Pamphilia's sense of inherited prerogative and Astrophil's hard-won entitlement. Both of them complain about demands that aristocratic status imposes upon them as a new conception of the nation takes shape. The conclusion of Sidney's *Old Arcadia,* and hence of the composite *Arcadia* published by the countess of Pembroke in 1593, illustrates the meaning of *liberty* in this context as its action evokes Livy's narrative of Junius Brutus' harsh judgment against his sons at the foundation of the Roman Republic.[24] Here the heroes Pyrocles and his cousin Musidorus have been arrested for complicity in the apparent death of King Basilius. The latter's successor, Euarchus of Macedonia, Pyrocles' father, brings the suspects to trial and, like Brutus, condemns them to death even though they are his son and nephew: "I prefer you much before my life, but I prefer justice as far before you" (356). Musidorus assails the austere verdict as a "bloody conquest," and Pyrocles offers to die for both of them: "Let Musidorus live, and Pyrocles shall live in him, and you shall not want a child" (358). The heroes are saved only when Basilius awakens from what has been a sleep induced by magic potions. Euarchus resigns from his kingship, "more glad than of the whole world's monarchy to be rid of his miserable magistracy" (360), and equitable rule is providentially restored.[25]

The tempering of justice with mercy and the conduct of equitable rule figure as important themes in *Arcadia,* but they also generate important motifs in *Astrophil and Stella,* and they inflect the context of Wroth's *Urania* and

Pamphilia to Amphilanthus as well. Astrophil's questions in sonnet 47 are not entirely rhetorical:

> What, have I thus betrayed my libertie?
> Can those blacke beames such burning markes engrave
> In my free side? or am I borne a slave,
> Whose necke becomes such yoke of tyranny?

Here *liberty* and its off-rhyme *tyranny* figure in three important senses argued by the Petrarchan commentators—social or patrimonial, personal or psychological, and moral or theological. Astrophil cannot quite coordinate their implications as his *liberty* slides from the state of "exemption or freedom from arbitrary, despotic, or autocratic rule or control" (OED sense 2) toward a chaotic state of "unrestrained action, conduct, or expression; freedom of behavior or speech, beyond what is granted or recognized as proper" (OED sense 5). His construction of *tyranny* likewise implies a psychological condition in which an "unjustly severe use of one's authority" (OED sense 3) slides toward "violence, outrage, villany" (OED sense 3b). Finally, his use of the word *faith* initiates a devotional trajectory in the second quatrain:

> Or want I sense to feele my miserie?
> Or spite, disdaine of such disdaine to have?
> Who for long faith, tho dayly helpe I crave,
> May get no almes but scorne of beggerie.

Unlike the spiritual *fede* of Mary and Peter in Petrarch's sonnet 95, Astrophil's *faith* reduces him to contemptible meanness. When in the sestet he summons, "Virtue awake," he regards "virtue" as an efficacious moral power to help him recover the personal freedom he thinks he has lost.

A model for Astrophil's ensuing resolve ("I may, I must, I can, I will, I do) and his sudden failure of nerve ("soft, but here she comes!") is Petrarch's sonnet 169. In Petrarch's poem the speaker loses control the moment he sees Laura, "sì dolce et ria / Che l'alma trema per levarsi a volo" 'so sweet and cruel that my soul trembles to rise in flight.' Upon descrying in her eyes a pity that he cannot verify, "s'i' non erro" 'if I do not err,' he is overcome by an impulse to declare his torment to her. No sooner does he formulate his intent than he stops short: "Tanto gli ò a dir che 'ncominciar non oso" 'I have so much to say to her that I dare not begin.' The crisis points to a more volatile issue than his poetic ability to express Laura's excellence. It concerns the lover's moral responsibility and his enslavement to the senses.

Sixteenth-century commentators register opposing views on these conflicts. Some construe them as wholly interior. Fausto da Longiano, for example, locates the action entirely within the speaker's imagination, "stando nella imaginatione d'hauer a parlar alla sua donna" 'posing in his imagination the act of having to speak to his lady' (62v). For Sylvano da Venafro the speaker grows anxious—"Che l'alma trema per levarsi a volo" 'That my soul trembles to rise in flight'—not because he doubts his ability to address the beloved but because the moment of ecstasy is so intense that it undoes him: "Che l'alma sua tremava per leuarsi a uuolo. Per lasciar le membra. Et non gia come Altri dicono per . . . effettuar di parlarle, ch'era suo pensiero" 'His soul was trembling to rise in flight, to leave behind its bodily members; the reason is not, as others claim, . . . to carry out his plan of telling her what his thoughts were' (cxxxiiiv). In Daniello's gloss, "Pien d'un vago pensier che me desvia / Da tutti gli altri, et fammi al mondo ir solo" 'Full of a yearning thought that makes me stray away from all others and go alone in the world,' refers to the speaker's rapt imagination: "SOLO: perche non è simile à quello de gli altri amanti, poco prezzando esso quel, ch'ogn'un desia" 'Alone, because it is similar to that of no other lovers, as he values little what everyone else desires' (113r). According to these commentators, the speaker wishes to prolong his experience of elevated thought.

Other commentators construe Petrarch's text in less idealized terms. Gesualdo, for example, mocks certain glossators, "ingegnosi giovani" 'ingenious young readers,' who imagine that "Poe. pieno del detto pensiero solo n'andasse a se stesso involandosi, ricercando colla mente M.L." 'full of the aforementioned thoughts, the poet walks alone, stealing away by himself, seeking Laura in his imagination.' Gesualdo prefers to imagine a face-to-face encounter between Petrarch and Laura: "Non uuol dir altro, se non che disiando, e temendo d'adiempiere il suo disire nel'apparir di lei grauemente sospiraua" 'It cannot mean anything else but that, desiring her and fearing to fulfill his desire, he would sigh solemnly in her presence' (ccxxv). The speaker cannot put into adequate words his own dense feelings. Castelvetro spells out the tension when he paraphrases the poem's last line: "Tante sono le cose, che io ho da dire, che io temo, dicendole tutte, d'offenderla, per essere troppe" 'So many are the things I have to say, that in saying all of them I fear to offend her with their quantity' (312).

Vestiges of this tension pervade Astrophil's complaint. In the presence of Stella he lacks the discipline, the emotional maturity, and the moral resources to keep liberty from collapsing into license, and the outcome is actually funny. Involuntary weakness at the end of sonnet 47 propels him to abandon his resolve:

> Vertue awake, Beautie but beautie is,
> I may, I must, I can, I will, I do
> Leave following that, which it is gaine to misse.
> Let her go. Soft, but here she comes. Go to,
> Unkind, I love you not: O me, that eye
> Doth make my heart give to my tongue the lie.

Astrophil's anxieties seep out explicitly in scriptural contexts, among which "Or am I born a slave, / Whose neck becomes such yoke of tyranny?" resonates against St. Paul's "Ye are bogh̄t with a price: be not the seruants of men" (1 Cor. 7.23). He simply does not correlate his behavior with Paul's teaching.

Scripture implies a judgment upon Astrophil in other ways as well. Although no Christian should be or become another's slave, in 1 Timothy 6.1–2 Paul urges servants to respect their masters, especially those who profess Christian faith: "Thei which haue beleuing masters, let them not despise them." Masters who perform God's will—including leaders of the church and state and certainly England's annointed monarch who governs the Church in this particular kingdom—merit loyalty. Others do not. This warning captures God's people in a double bind. Paul cautions that not all human leaders serve God as they should, for some "shall departe from the faith, and shal give hede vnto spirits of errour." Paul's text promotes resistance to corrupt authority never more powerfully than when it associates false doctrine with the effeminacy of "old wiues fables" (Greek *graōdeis múthos,* Latin *aniles fabulas*) and its remedy with an exercise of militant Christianity: "But cast away prophane, and old wiues fables, & exercise thy self vnto godlines" (1 Tim. 4.7). For a militant Protestant like Philip Sidney, especially after his retreat from Elizabeth's court in 1580, such a text might justify his criticism of the queen's proposed marriage with the duke d'Anjou.[26] For a deluded sensualist like Astrophil, Paul's text might reinforce the lover's self-proclaimed ends, one of which is, perversely, to justify his rejection of the court's rules about sexual conduct.

When Astrophil does so, he is asserting his own willful prerogative beyond that of any sovereign, church, or bureaucratic state. His reasoning rests upon the presumptive conception of *libertà* implied in Daniello's analogy between Petrarch's speaker and the Brutus of Virgil's *Aeneid.* The liberty whose loss Astrophil laments has everything to do with his fixation upon a *patria* and a patrimony—strangely overdetermined because the lineage and wealth of this historical author came not from his father but from his mother (Mary Dudley, daughter of the duke of Northumberland) and his wife (Frances Walsingham, daughter of Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's principal secretary of state),

Sidney's *matria* (to coin a neologism) and his matrimony.[27] Petrarch's commentators warn about the lover's moral life, as Vellutello, Gesualdo, and Castelvetro do when they evoke his bondage to sin, but Astrophil pays no attention. He fixes his understanding of freedom upon a self-justifying and self-promoting sense of *libertà.*

Wroth's sonnet 14 offers a different perspective on noble autonomy and amatory choice. In her poem Pamphilia initially projects a resolution stronger than any of Astrophil's. The speaker's rhetorical questions leave no doubt about the depth of her self-assurance. They test her sense of the "powers" and "strength" that she needs in order to remain free:

> Am I thus conquer'd? have I lost the powers
> That to withstand, which joy's to ruin mee?
> Must I bee still while itt my strength devowres
> And captive leads mee prisoner, bound, unfree?

Part of her self-assurance issues from a confident, even defiant, enumeration of impossibilities (in the rhetorical form of a *recusatio*) which must occur before she concedes to Love:

> Love first shall leave mens phant'sies to them free,
> Desire shall quench loves flames, spring hate sweet
> showres,
> Love shall loose all his darts, have sight, and see
> His shame, and wishings hinder happy howres.

At first it seems unclear how these possibilities might resolve her questions. Petrarchan convention would encourage a positive resolution with negative consequences: Yes, I am conquered, I have lost my powers, I must be still. In Petrarch's sonnet 145, "Ponmi ove 'l sole occide i fiori et l'erba" 'Place me where the sun kills the flowers and the grass,' for example, amatory devotion can only prove debilitating so long as nature itself abhors contradiction. The self-defensive posturing of Wroth's lover, on the other hand, encourages the opposite response, a negative resolution with positive consequences: No, I am not conquered, I have not lost my powers, I cannot be still.

As it unfolds, the poem supports both responses in radical contrariety. The speaker can resist servitude only by giving herself wholly and freely to a love that occupies her. But she must also subordinate her love to the claims of gender, class, and rank, partly because in the fictional narrative of *Urania* she herself is the queen of a nation and is therefore subject to the moral discipline that she requires of others. The impression of contrariety seems particularly acute

as the poem stages its conflict of discourses. The first quatrain, for example, projects scriptural overtones from Paul—the call to resist being "conquer'd," to "withstand" what can "ruin" faithful service, to avoid being "still" as this wicked force "strength devowres / And captive leads mee prisoner." The second quatrain displays an anacreontic imagination that Petrarch's commentators find disturbing in the *Rime sparse*—the lover's "phant'sies," love's "flames," springtime's "showres," Cupid's "darts and blindness." Against the latter Pamphilia's scriptural echoes iterate her positive commitment to active virtue.

The contest between scriptural and anacreontic discourses reaches its climax in the sestet. Here Pamphilia asserts her resistance to "love's purblind charms": "Why should wee nott loves purblind charmes resist? / Must wee bee servile, doing what hee list?" Reinforcing Scripture's claims, the queen of Morea unequivocally asserts her moral independence when she banishes the figure of Cupid: "Noe, seeke some hoste to harbour thee: I fly / Thy babish trickes, and freedome doe profess." Once again the anacreontic mode represented by a mischievous Cupid clashes with the scriptural mode. Scriptural meanings of *host* might evoke the Lord God of Hosts or possibly the bread of Communion (Latin *hostia* [sacrifice, victim]) which reconciles sinners to the deity. Its secular meanings evoke the military might of an assembled army (Latin *hostis* [armed host]) and the reciprocal duties of hospitality as either household master or guest (Latin *hostis* [host, guest]). Its negative meaning evokes the sense of an enemy presence (Latin *hostis* [enemy]). These discordant possibilities heighten the impact of struggle in Pamphilia's narrative, a struggle that the speaker's concluding lines overturn: "Butt O my hurt, makes my lost hart confess / I love, and must: So farwell liberty." Pamphilia cannot defeat Cupid or resist the claims of love. Everything that she does only reinforces her attachment to Amphilanthus. In a capitulation that recalls how Astrophil and Petrarch's speaker surrendered to love, Pamphilia succumbs to amatory bondage.

Pamphilia's compromise nonetheless differs from that of Petrarch or Astrophil. In his commentary on Petrarch's sonnet 169 Vellutello interprets the speaker's verbal paralysis as a result of awe before Laura's virtue. Her sweetness moves him to extol her excellence, but her chastity urges him to silence. As Vellutello explains, "l'anima . . . trema & non ardisce per la rigidita, dalla qual vede tal dolcezza in lei essere accompagnata" 'his soul trembles and he dares nothing because of the moral austerity that he sees accompany her extreme sweetness' (91^{r}). While Pamphilia certainly cannot attribute any active virtue to the unfaithful Amphilanthus, she may still act as Laura did for Petrarch, as a spur to motivate his potential for virtue. And, while she might view her sur-

render of liberty as something that imperils her right to rule as queen of Morea and of Pamphilia, she nonetheless submits to love in confidence that her virtue will prevail.

Wroth's reworkings of Philip and Mary Sidney's poetry parallel reworkings by their literary progeny, Samuel Daniel (1562–1619) and Fulke Greville (1554–1628), who would express divergent currents of national sentiment while professing their allegiance to the Sidneian norm. Daniel's "The Complaint of Rosamund," a dramatic monologue appended to his sonnet sequence *Delia* from 1592 onward, reverses Petrarchan idealism as it recounts salacious incidents about the historical Rosamund Clifford, mistress of Henry II and ancestral relative of Philip Sidney's one-time rival, George Clifford, earl of Cumberland.[28] The incidents so besmirch Rosamund's honor "that *Cliffords* race should scorne thee one of theyrs" (328–29).[29] Her sexual relationship with the king has deprived Rosamund "of libertie: / The onely good that women holde so deare" (499–500). As the poem's moral tone makes clear, this *libertie* is no vacuous freedom from sexual restraint but, rather, the right to claim legitimate offspring, *liberi,* with an affirmation of their paternal identity and a title to inheritance reserved for lawful progeny. Adulterous women forfeit this right as their extramarital activities risk contaminating bloodlines. A nearly forgotten footnote to national history, it now enlists sympathy for Daniel's would-be patroness Lady Margaret Clifford, the long estranged wife of Rosamund's descendant.[30]

Daniel's preferences for current and local forms led him a decade later to abandon a superannuated Petrarchism for the timely allure of drama and masque at the Stuart court and finally to abandon the invention of versified history for "the common tongue" of prose history, as he avers in his 1609 dedication of *The Civil Wars* (begun in 1594) to Mary Sidney.[31] Here Daniel's account of heroes who "haue brought / Nations and Kingdomes vnder our command" seems a fairly transparent effort to narrate a national history in accord with James I's foreign and domestic policies (2.123–24).[32] Unlike the individualist heroes of *Arcadia,* the heroes of Daniel's *Civil Wars* are corporate players who subordinate their (often considerable) egos to national unity.

Meanwhile, in *Musophilus* 'Lover of the Muses' (dedicated to Greville in 1599) Daniel figures the effects of the national language against the workings of "this busie world" and "profit-seeking age" (10–13), in an effort to "make men see the weapons of the mind / Are states best strengths and kingdoms chiefest grace" (841–42). Against Philocosmus (Lover of the World) he extols the vernacular eloquence of "this little point, this scarce discerned Ile, / Thrust

from the world" (427–29), forecasting its effect on future civilizations through colonial expansion, "T'inrich vnknowing Nations with our stores" (960). By *nations* Philip Sidney had implied a system of pedigreed biological descent according to circumstances of birth, evoking the lineage to which his family aspired. Daniel extends the word's meaning to include those in the future born of a colonizing stock who, though living abroad, will be one with the people of England in their legal and political institutions and in the culture and discourse that have shaped them. In his usage the word *nation* implies a strong bond among distant peoples, one forged by a constantly changing and ever-evolving language that links far-flung communities, as events happening in one region or locality impinge upon those happening in another far away.

From this premise springs Daniel's appreciation of the English language in *A Defence of Ryme* (dedicated to William Herbert in 1603) as one that startlingly reverses conventional humanist assumptions about the impulsive power of language. Lorenzo de' Medici's *Commento* and Du Bellay's *Deffence,* for example, had argued that a canonically stabilized language might help to regulate political, legislative, and judicial institutions in an expanding nation. Daniel provisionally agrees that among these forms there are "as many shapes as there be tongues or nations in the world" (135), but he differs in relating cause to effect. Whereas earlier writers had attributed the spread of the Roman Empire to the imposition of its language, Daniel attributes such spread to brute force: "They may thank their sword that made their tongues so famous and vniuersall as they are" (136). The dialectic of Daniel's argument leads to a cultural relativism in which no absolute standard forecasts the achievement of any given epoch or civilization. Every language, every culture, every system of thought, "hath alwayes some disposition of worth" (140), but none has a monopoly on it, and none can predict what it may achieve or fail to achieve.

Daniel's chief example for such excellence is "*Franciscus Petrarcha* (who then no doubt likewise found whom to imitate)" (140). Not only does Petrarch's genius defy any logical expectation by originating in a still barbarous age, but it also defies any anticipated result by triumphing in the vernacular rather than in Latin, "all which notwithstanding wrought him not that glory & fame in his owne Nation, as did his Poems in Italian" (141). One implication may be that, if all genius is local or particular, then every genius is eccentric and by definition unpredictable. The concomitant that Daniel espouses would deny the existence of most, perhaps all, universal rules, except for the one rule that genius appears "vniuersall" in all cultures "and all seasons hath them in some sort" (143). So Daniel curbs the humanist tendency to privilege

the absolute model of Greco-Roman antiquity as he valorizes modernity. But, just as his defense of rhyme in the vernacular requires him to disparage even "mine owne daintinesse" in savoring Continental forms (156), so it also leads him to disclaim the idea of any dominant or canonical national form.[33] There are only concrete particulars of excellence whose collective appeal defies categorization. The idea of the nation appears more than the sum of its parts.

Just as Daniel moved from Petrarchan poetry to versified history, so Fulke Greville moved from his sonnet sequence *Caelica* (in which he already renounced Petrarchan excess in the beloved's complaint that "I offer wrong to my beloued Saint, / I scorne, I change, I falsify my loue" [sonnet 18]) to the unadorned didactic versification of his *Treatie of Monarchy, Of Humane Learning, Of Religion, Of Warres,* and *An Inquisition upon Fame and Honour,* written in the first decade of the Stuart era.[34] Here Greville places a new emphasis upon personal initiative, now disciplined to meet the economic needs of a regenerated nation. *An Inquisition,* for example, meditates upon the hollow but yet necessary and self-validating pursuit of financial gain and concludes that the temptation to idolize personal honor is worse than the temptation to seek private wealth or even creatural pleasure: "Of which three baytes [*Gaine, Honour, Pleasure*], yet *Honour* seemes the chiefe" (st. 2). A sedate enjoyment of financial reward and of modest comforts that accrue from it can in fact keep human beings on a godly course against the "hypocrisies of hell" (st. 18), those delusions of self-love which divide people, destroy groups, and fracture the commonwealth.[35] The upshot for Greville is a classic demonstration of a toughened Protestant initiative in its steadfast devotion to a productive work ethic, corroborated in the outward marks of success which affirm God's favor and in the ties that bind citizens to one another. Money can be good for you as long as you earn it in good conscience, and it can be good for the nation as long as citizens manage it with sober circumspection.[36]

Ironically, Greville's most important modification to the Sidneian synthesis of heroic action and religious principle occurs in *The Life of Sidney* (1610–14?, published 1652). What Philip Sidney had only vaguely fantasized, his biographer shapes into a national agenda. During Sidney's dying days attendant surgeons labored upon him "to doe him good, and (as they thought) many Nations in him."[37] Here the word *Nations* refers to all those participants in the international Protestant League whom Sidney sought to unite. Early chapters of the *Life* are filled with accounts of homage to the fallen hero, "reverenced by forraigne *Nations* in one forme, of his owne in another" (26). In his visits to the Protestant Netherlands he "awaked that confident *Nation*" to mistrust

Spain and the papacy (28). Chapters 8 through 10 offer a "survay of forraine *Nations*" (52), with pointed insights into the strengths and weaknesses of each, geared toward a program of European diplomacy for 1610. Sidney encouraged the expedition of Francis Drake, for example, less to colonize the New World than to readjust Europe's economic balance by "fetchinge away Spain's golden fleece" (57). In Greville's argument for the case, Drake's effort would provide "forraine employment" for potentially disruptive individuals in England, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland and so avert their factionalism, as "the word [gold] was an attractive Adamant to make men venture that which they have" (71, 75). By 1610, however, the Crown had already chartered the Virginia Company, formed for the expressed purpose of encouraging individuals to pursue their own acquisition of wealth. In the economic climate that ensued, the monarch could only negotiate among competing factions, as Greville imputes Elizabeth to have done. His representation of her intervening among the "Regiment of her *Grandees,*" "her yeomanry," and "her Peasantes" (118), allowing none an upper hand over the others, belies the late decades of her reign but addresses initiatives under way to consolidate national sentiment in the early years of James's reign.[38]

The ideals that Philip Sidney had represented, based on the concept of a heritable nobility dedicated to the profession of arms in the name of the nation, evolve in Greville's writing to a new set of ideals associated with personal property, corporate solidarity, and more fluid notions of social distinction. Tudor policy from Henry VII to Elizabeth I had sought to pacify an autarchic, activist nobility by transforming it into a class of courtiers noted for compliance and assiduity. Whether through attainder, confiscation, or execution, the monarchy replaced the old lords with a new aristocracy recruited from the upper gentry and urban bourgeoisie on the basis of its willingness to work for the Crown and pay for the title.[39] Since in theory any talented male with access to training and opportunity (still, of course, tightly limited in the seventeenth century) might increase his wealth and rise to an elite status through diligence, effort, and sheer application, one might think of the general populace as a major resource for ennobling the nation. One might, that is, identify the strength of the nation with its active and dynamic population. It was an idea that had evolved half-hidden in the trope of Petrarchan *libertà,* opening itself from moral and theological associations in the commentaries to social and political ones and enscripted in the history of Petrarchism from Daniel to Greville. Against these vaguely demotic tendencies, Wroth would renew a Sidneian response on the high platform of aristocratic honor and noble virtue.

12 *Byblis and the Bible*

Incest, Endogamy, and Mary Wroth

Mary Wroth's continued identification with the Sidney lineage is conspicuous in her sexual involvement with William Herbert. The birth of their illegitimate children (probably around 1623, alluded to fictively in the Second Part of *Urania*) speaks to their mutual disdain for courtly society's gossip and to their secure sense of privileged autonomy.[1] Edward Herbert, later lord of Cherbury (1582–1648), the elder brother of the poet George Herbert and a kinsman of William, projects their blithe disregard in "A Merry Rhyme Sent to the Lady Wroth upon the Birth of My Lord of Pembroke's Child," a poem whose inbred monorhyme correlates wittily with the child's incestuous lineage. Wroth, he muses, has augmented her metrical accomplishments with "a further art," since, "as everybody knows," the birth of her love child has added "to those feet fine dainty toes." Herbert offers to defend her against accusation—"While thus attired we'll oppose / The tragic buskins of our foes"—and he concludes with witty approval of her pregnancy: "'Tis no matter how it shows: / All I care is, if the child grows."[2] Whether "foes" had objected to the incest or to the illegitimacy, or to both, mattered little. Neither Wroth nor Pembroke made any effort to regularize their union.

Wroth's attachment to Pembroke no doubt dampened for her the appeal of other conjugal prospects. He was a swank companion, an amateur of poetry, theater, and the arts, a sponsor with his brother Philip of the first printed folios of Ben Jonson (1616) and of William Shakespeare (1623), and since the age of twenty no novice in illegitimate parentage after his affair with Mary Fitton. Nor was he a stranger to endogamous nuptials. In 1604 he married his

kinswoman, Mary Talbot, a daughter of the earl of Shrewsbury, into whose family both his father and paternal aunt had married.[3] Such unions were not unusual among the aristocracy to prevent the dispersal of inherited titles and estates through usurpation by outsiders. Inversely, the practice of exogamy among the middle and lower classes enabled those without title or estate to form suprafamilial bonds that reinforce interlocking, interpenetrating layers of geopolitical community.[4]

Endogamy, a contract of marriage among close kin, is of course not incest, the "uncomely claspings" of Shakespeare's *Pericles* 1.1.128, which concerns passion or sexual violence among close kin. Endogamy is rather a social arrangement designed to shore up and concentrate the precise designations of caste which incest would blur by confounding relationships among family members.[5] The etymology of *incest* from *incastus* (unchaste) suggests the undoing of *castus* (caste) that could follow from a violation of *castitas* (chastity). Wives and mothers are enjoined to be *castae* (chaste) in order to safeguard and protect the *castus* (caste) of propertied classes, enabling husbands and fathers to identify their children and endow them with legal rights in a line of descent.[6] With respect to endogamous marriage between first cousins, neither Scripture nor English law forbids such unions. Both in fact allow them, the latter since 1540, when English statute legalized marriage between first cousins in order to legitimate Henry VIII's match with Catherine Howard, concurrently shifting jurisdiction over marital contracts from canon law and church courts to that of civil law and state courts.[7] This statute mobilized the major scriptural proof texts for marriage, Deuteronomy 25.5–10 and Leviticus 18.4–23 and 20.10–20, none of which prohibits unions between first cousins or even between uncles and nieces.[8] Nor could the dark side of the Tudor ancestral myth about King Arthur's parricidal death at the hands of Mordred, incestuously begotten upon Arthur's sister, Morgawse, dispel the lure of such marriages among the aristocracy.[9]

The paradoxical upshot and antithesis of Henry's marital policy was the refusal of Elizabeth I—a self-imposed taboo, really—to marry anyone. So riddled with charges of incest was her mother's life that she sublimated her own marriage prospects to an idea of suprafamilial siblinghood when she proclaimed herself a Virgin Queen, the Bride of England, and Mother of the English people.[10] Elizabeth's promulgation of a new pattern of social organization owes at least some of its iconic status to ancient religious teachings about incest, enabling her both to erase the stigma of a putatively incestuous birth and to herald the onset of an exceptional regeneration. An important tradition in both the Old and New Testaments stipulates that a convert to Judaism or

Christianity has undergone a passage from death to life in which he or she is newborn and is therefore no longer the same person.[11] All of the convert's old relationships are dissolved, so that this person is free to marry kin to whom he or she is now no longer considered to be related. Such close couplings acquired a distinctly religious value as a sign of conversion, rebirth, and miraculous renewal.[12] Incest emerges in this instance as the affirmation of a new order, a denial of submission to the old order, and a display of powerful beliefs about religious community and societal organization.

The sexual liaison between Wroth and Herbert invites analogous speculation about its relevance to issues of cultural exceptionality and national identity. England, as my earlier indications of its multicultural Celtic, Roman, Saxon, Anglian, Viking, and Norman contributions show, was a political entity with a composite history, and its drive to enforce homogeneous bonds of loyalty and allegiance required deliberate effort and systematic formulation.[13] Its idea of being or becoming a single collective entity evokes the fantasy of a family that believes it has evolved endogamously rather than exogamously, a product of spontaneous regeneration and natural cohesion rather than deliberate cross-bred union. We might explore this paradox in the First Part of *Urania,* in which in important ways Pamphilia figures as a double for Elizabeth I. Here incest plays a peculiar role, since not only are Pamphilia and Amphilanthus close kin—or so Parselius implies when as "my kinsman" he introduces Amphilanthus, brother of Urania and lover of his sister Pamphilia, implicating himself and Urania as well as Pamphilia and Amphilanthus in symmetrically endogamous relationships (23)—but so also are such incidental pairs of lovers as the Angler Woman and Laurimello (291–95) and Silvarine and an unnamed cousin (416–20). Spicing the mix in the Second Part of *Urania* are stories of the illegitimate offspring, Andromarko (287–89 and 408–18) and Faire Designe (323–31).

Parselius' pursuit of Urania leads to a particularly conspicuous narrative about incest. Urania resists his advances and, upon advice from the sage Melissea, persuades him to reverse his love by leaping with her from the Rock of St. Maura into the Sea of Oblivion. The plunge works its cure, whereupon "Parselius knew nothing of his former love to her . . . and being assured of her neerenesse to him in bloud, rejoyced with them" (First Part 230). In one respect the cure is easy because Parselius has already fallen in love with Dalinea. Upon being reunited, however, they arrive at an allegorically foreboding Tomb of Love. Here a "Brother and Sister, children to one man" chose to die rather than yield to the incestuous passion that possessed them (524). Wroth's narra-

tor seals the account with an allusion to the myth of Byblis' unchaste love for her brother Caunus, "yet the comparison holds not clearly, because these Lovers were chaste and pure after the secret was disclos'd" (525). The episode depicts the victory of self-control over unrestrained passion at a cost of human life, but it also exalts the purity of motives firing the incestuous pair.[14] They recognize their privileged autonomy as lovers, but they carefully acknowledge their debt to a broader community of family, kin, and nation which condemns their relationship. This action establishes a model for Pamphilia and Amphilanthus.

If we turn to Wroth's poetry and to its relationship with that of William Herbert, we find a powerful set of analogies associating both with the incestuous figures of Byblis and Caunus in classical myth. Herbert's poetry, for example, recalls the value of sublimating one's desire even when its speaker chooses frankly not to do so. In an elegy of seduction and resistance entitled "That Lust is not his Ayme," he protests that his goal is not simply carnal: "*OH* do not tax me with a brutish Love, / Impute not Lust alone to my desire."[15] He seeks to ennoble his love by incorporating the language of sacred devotion as "ravishment Divine, / Invincible to strength of humane hand, / Union Divine of mutual burning hearts, / . . . Sovereign delights, which God to man imparts." His insistence rings hollow as a largely appetitive argument contrived to weaken the beloved's high-principled defense. A particularly sordid comparison ("'Tis but a prostitute, and bestial joye / Which seekes the grosse materiall use alone") betrays his salacious intent.

The earl of Pembroke ought to have taken a leaf from the poetic practice of his cousin, George Herbert (1593–1633). As a young man, George appeared full of high promise in the Sidney family mold, especially upon his appointment in 1620 as Public Orator at Cambridge, a post that carried with it a virtual guarantee for future service to the Crown and nation in high office.[16] Before he abandoned his worldly career for ordination, he no doubt frequented his aunt Mary Sidney's glittering circle of writers, artists, and musicians at Wilton, sharing his poetry with William Herbert and Mary Wroth. His talent elegantly transforms the surface of Philip Sidney's secular style into the substance of religious verse. "Jordan I," for example, channels the "purling streams" of Astrophil's Helicon into the baptismal river of Jordan, where a "*sweetnesse readie penn'd*" redeems the Sidneian persona's injunction to "looke in thy heart and write."[17] "The Forerunners" recalls the "lovely enchanting language, sugarcane, / Hony of roses" of amatory verse now directed to self-meditation, while the celebrated rhythms of "The Collar" and "Affliction I" mime powerful conflicts between self-determination and predestination, free choice and divine

election: "But as I rav'd and grew more fierce and wilde / At every word, / Me thought I heard one calling, *Child!* / And I reply'd, *My Lord*" ("Collar").[18]

George Herbert directed the situations and devices of a fading Petrarchism to the service of his sacred poetry, but Mary Wroth turned them back to a carefully cultivated, powerfully regenerated Petrarchism. The extended conceits and astonishing mimetic effects of his style recur in her poetry. Sonnet 2 in the second series (P64) of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,* "Love like a jugler, comes to play his prise," for instance, mimes its own conceit of juggling by balancing a series of clauses in an elaborate syntactical acrobatics. Like a circus performer, Cupid attracts an audience:

> To see how cuningly hee, wanting eyes,
> Can yett deseave the best sight of desire:
> The wanton child, how hee can faine his fire
> So pretely, as none sees his disguise!

The poem's form mirrors its meaning as internal echoes deprive the end-rhyme and pentameter rhythm of their expected finality. The juggler's legerdemain is replicated by subtle internal echoes of *hee/see, wanting/wanton,* and, in the next quatrain, *sleights/sight.* His spectators succumb to this illusionary art in a contrapuntal monosyllabic beat:

> For men can only by theyr slieghts abuse
> The sight with nimble, and delightful skill;
> Butt if hee play, his gaine is our lost will:
> Yett childlike, wee can nott his sports refuse.

Wroth's representation of Cupid's audience as "childlike" in the grip of his performance dramatizes the irresistibility of his appeal. The "wanton child" infantalizes his captive viewers with spellbinding technique. The "lost will" that he secures is erotic desire, in this case the lovers' mutual attraction. As the poem's figurations evoke the sonneteering of a bygone era, they summon Philip Sidney's experiments from the early 1580s, Mary Sidney's editing of them in the 1590s, Robert Sidney's restyling of them in his own maturity, and William Herbert's transpositions of them in the new century. Petrarchism provides a holding ground for all these endeavors, allowing Wroth to recall the lyric achievements of her predecessors.

William Herbert's single surviving incursion into the fourteen-line sonnet form trades Petrarchan restraint for Ovidian license. The poem amounts to a cynical defense of inconstancy on the grounds that nothing in nature, neither rivers nor streams nor the changing face of Fortune, remains forever con-

stant. The Ovidian context recalls mythic lovers who pursue their reluctant beloveds in watery environments: Acteon's spying upon Diana in her stream, Narcissus' gazing at himself in his gentle pool, and Alpheus' flowing toward Arethusa in a gliding current. It focuses upon the fickleness of Cupid, "The Fantastick boy . . . / Who ne're kept word in promis'd joy" (p. 75), comparing him to a purling stream that charms river banks:

> So glides a long the wanton Brook
> With gentle pace into the main,
> Courting the banks with amorous look,
> He never means to see again.

Likewise, Fortune appears poised to beguile the "swelling hopes" of those who arrive at the height of "short liv'd" success. The poem's sestet makes explicit the comparison with Cupid, "the god of the ill-manag'd flames," who deceives alike the lover and his "loving Dames." In a seriation that instantiates excess (deploying *both/and* for more than two members) the concluding couplet reaffirms the speaker's inconstancy: "So all alike will constant prove, / Both fortune, running streams, and Love."

Wroth's sonnet 44 offers a possible response to this Ovidian fantasy as the speaker addresses a running stream and approves soulfully of its swift flight away from her. Not only does it outrun her tears, but it also escapes her distress and the ills that attend her broken heart:

> How fast thou hast'st (O spring) with sweetest speed
> To catch thy waters which befor are runn,
> And of the greater rivers wellcom wunn,
> 'Ere thes thy new borne streames thes places feed.
> Yett you doe well least staying heere might breed
> Dangerous fluds your sweetest banks t'orerunn,
> And yett much better my distress to shunn
> Which makes my teares your swiftest course succeed.
> Butt best you doe when with soe hasty flight,
> You fly my ills which now my self outgoe,
> Whose broken hart can testify such woe,
> That soe o'recharg'd my lyfe blood wasteth quite.
> Sweet spring then keepe your way, bee never spent
> And my ill days, or griefs assunder rent.

Two mythic reminiscences problematize the poem's meaning. One evokes Arethusa as the speaker emphasizes her flight from amatory involvement; the other concerns Byblis as the speaker's tears merge with the stream and increase its force.

In the first instance Arethusa's story, drawn from book 5 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* tells of the nymph's efforts to outrun the ravishing river god Alpheus and her transformation into a stream that carries her to safety.[19] Pamphilia by contrast has not resisted Amphilanthus' pursuit. She instead suffers a broken heart upon being abandoned by him. Ovid enfolds the story of Arethusa within another narrative about the rape of Proserpina and her subsequent espousal to her uncle Pluto brokered by her father Jupiter. The narrative of incestuous coupling furnishes an archetype for the idea of marriage as a legal contract negotiated by the bride's family to ensure the safe transmission of title and inheritance to the couple's legitimate offspring. The story of Arethusa provides an antithetical counterpoint. Proserpina becomes a queen but laments her consignment to Hades. Arethusa meanwhile frustrates her pursuer's advances and gets on with her life through an elective metamorphosis: "Delia rupit humum, caecisque ego mersa cavernis" 'The Delian maiden split open the earth and I plunged into its gloomy caverns' (5.639).

The story of Byblis, drawn from book 9 of the *Metamorphoses,* considers the matter of incest from an entirely different emotional angle. Here Byblis falls passionately in love with her twin brother, Caunus. Finding herself unable to speak about her love, she proclaims it in a letter in which she rationalizes her contempt for law and custom. She begs exemption from the taboo against incest by affirming her high birth and comparing herself to the inbred deities: "cuncta licere / credimus, et sequimur magnorum exempla deorum" 'we believe all things allowed; and in this we do but follow the example of the gods' (9.554–55). When Caunus rejects her plea, she pursues him abroad, and, in grief, she dissolves into a fountain of tears: "Sic lacrimis consumpta suis Phoebeia Byblis / vertitur in fontem" 'So Phoebean Byblis, consumed by her tears, is changed into a fountain' (9.663–64). Byblis' dissolution provides Wroth with a powerful Ovidian subtext for sonnet 44, in which the speaker's tears swell the spring's water, "Dangerous fluds your sweetest banks t'orerunn."

Wroth's sonnet enacts the incestuous attractions of Ovid's tale. The homophonic echoes of its first line weave a texture of sonoric identity which overtakes the verse: H*ow* . . . th*ou,* f*ast* . . . h*ast' st,* h*ast' st* . . . sweete*st sp*ring . . . *sp*eed, *spr*i*n*g . . . w*i*th, *w*ith . . . s*w*eetest, sw*ee*test . . . sp*ee*d. As the stream hastens "to catch thy waters," acts of reduplication occur not only in subject and object positions, "thes streames feed thes places," but also in the poem's figurations of birth and maternal nourishment. The streams are "new borne," though begotten of familiar waters, and they threaten to flood the environment with their own profligate generation as they "feed" these places.

The poem's second quatrain extends these figures of generation and sexual reproduction. Resemblance overwhelms the speaker's expression of fear with verbal repetition ("yett . . . And yett"), identical rhyme ("runn" "ore'runn"), and syntactic parallelism ("your sweetest banks," "your swiftest course"). The "ills" that "outgoe" the speaker—the tears that issue from her eyes—are products of her own making. They extend her material being, literally pressed out of herself and forced to circulate in the external world. The semantics of *testify* in line 11 underscores this point. Its etymology from the Latin *testis* (testicle) refers to the act of swearing by placing a hand on the testicles to bear witness (*testis* [witness]) to an oath that binds oneself and one's heirs, the issue of one's seed.[20] When Pamphilia testifies to her love, she implies its power to grow and produce a facsimile of herself in self-begotten form. She becomes a perfect image of radical self-identity, sui generis, an entropic fulfillment of isotropic generation.

Like the octave, the poem's sestet deploys repetition and reprisal as mimetic embodiments of incestuous resemblance. The dominance of *o* sounds (*doe, soe, outgoe, broken, woe, soe o're, flood*) homogenizes the poetic texture, while internal echoes in the final couplet (sw*ee*t . . . k*ee*pe . . . b*ee* . . . gr*ie*fs, *sp*ring . . . *sp*ent, th*en* . . . sp*ent* . . . r*ent,* w*ay* . . . d*ay*) bind the verse in its disjointed syntax: "Sweet spring then keepe your way, bee never spent / And my ill days, or griefs assunder rent." Absorbed in her own inanition, Pamphilia risks losing contact with the outside world. Like Byblis, she may consume herself in grief, renouncing her queenly obligation to form and sustain extrafamilial ties.

Juxtaposed against the Ovidian subtext is a scriptural text that turns Pamphilia's unfulfilled urges to higher ends. It regenerates her Sidneian legacy by echoing Mary Sidney's versions of Psalms 69 and 104.[21] In the former, "Troublous seas my soule surround," the speaker begs God's aid to save his soul in troubled waters, "sinking, where it feeles noe ground, / In the gulph, this whirling hoale" (2–4). The Geneva commentary allegorizes the waters of Psalm 69 as a figure for "what great dangers Dauid was [in], out of the which God did deliuer him." Not the least danger was the temptation to despair: "To my kynn a stranger quite, / Quite an alian am I grown" (25–26). Thus the speaker pleads in desperation, "Calme these waves, these waters bay, / Leave me not this whirlpooles pray" (47–48). Here the Geneva commentary summons a lesson in faith: "He sheweth a liuelie faith, in that he assureth himself, that God is fauorable to him."

Pamphilia's complaint expresses a similar faith. In Psalm 104, "Make O my soule the subject of thy Songe," the Lord channels the flood's waters as a sign of His power over humankind and all nature: "*But* at thy rebuke thei flee: at

the voice of thy thunder thei haste awaie." Buttressing the sense of order implied here, the Geneva commentary emphasizes the working of Divine Providence as a principle of control: "If by the power thou didest not bridle the rage of the waters, it were not possible, but the whole worlde shulde be destroied." In Mary Sidney's translation a threefold repetition of *haste* in participial, substantive, and adjectival forms reinforces the Psalmist's praise of divine order: "Hastning their hast with spurr of hasty feare" (l. 24). *Haste,* the verb that Pamphilia attributes to the stream at the beginning of her poem, likewise signals a recognition of order and self-control as the water's swift current prevents its own overflow: "How fast thou hast'st (O spring) with sweetest speed / To catch thy waters which befor are runn." As Pamphilia meditates upon the stream's resistance to a chaotic flood, she comes to see in it the opposite of her own rampant impulses.

In the sestet Pamphilia asserts that the waters do "best" when they flow so fast that they exceed her grasp: "Butt best you doe when with soe hasty flight, / You fly my ills which now my self outgoe." The Ovidian paradox of averting danger by running before it as Arethusa did recalls Mary Sidney's Psalm 107, in which for those "in wofull plight" the Lord "His succour sent doth end their woe" (81–82). Thus the Lord changes "well watred grounds" into "thirsty sand" and vice versa: "To watry pooles doth desertes change!/ And on the fields that fruitlesse stand, / Makes trickling springs unhoped range!" (94–96). One result is to make the desert habitable as a site for human life: "A Colony they there do make, / They dwell, and build, and sow, and plant, / And of their paines greate profitt take" (97–99). Here the Geneva commentary attributes this deliverance of God's people to Divine Love, "For the loue that he beareth to his Church he changeth the ordre of nature for their commoditie." Pamphilia sublimates her incestuous fantasies in this recourse to Scripture, replacing *eros* with *agape,* carnal love with a spiritual love that has passed through the mediation of *philia,* brotherly love. Male and female, husband and wife, brother and sister, become one in the eyes of the Lord, fulfilling at once an ideal of universal love expressed in Mary Sidney's version of Psalm 133:

> How good, and how beseeming well
> It is that wee,
> Who brethren be,
> As brethren, should in concord dwell.
> (1–4)

Such an ideal undoes the taboo of polluted incest as it figures a communal siblinghood, a fraternal and sororal amity, a nation of brothers and sisters.

Wroth's fusion of scriptural texts with Ovidian subtexts finds analogues in Petrarch's poetry. In canzone 23, "Nel dolce tempo de la prima etade" 'In the sweet time of my first age,' for example, Petrarch's speaker enacts a series of transformations (one of them echoing Byblis') begotten by his desire for Laura; and in the *Trionfo della morte 2,* a text translated by Mary Sidney as the *Triumph of Death* (possibly part of a complete translation of the *Trionfi* now lost), Laura recounts her love for Petrarch in terms that will locate Ovid's story of Byblis in scriptural territory.[22] For the Petrarchan commentators both texts evoke Byblis' letter of confession to Caunus: "Incipit et dubitat, scribit damnataque tabellas, / et notat et delet, mutat culpatque probatque" 'She begins, then hesitates and stops, writes on and hates what she has written' (9.523–24), culminating in her desperate appeal: "Tu servare potes, tu perdere solus amantem" 'You alone can save, you only can destroy your lover' (547). In canzone 23 Petrarch's speaker likewise commits his own words to paper and ink:

> Le vive voci m'erano interditte;
> ond'io gridai con carta et con incostro:
> Non son mio, no. S'io moro, il danno è vostro.
> (98–100)
>
> Words spoken aloud were forbidden me; so I cried out with paper and ink:
> "I am not my own, no; if I die, yours is the loss."

As Vellutello explains, these lines evoke Byblis' infamous confession: "CON charta et con inchiostro, cio è scrisse a M. L. come Biblis a Cauno" 'With paper and ink, that is, he wrote to Laura as Byblis wrote to Caunus' (97^{v}).

Curiously, the canzone inverts its speaker's gender when it compares him to Byblis. The *Trionfo della morte 2,* on the other hand, directs the comparison in a gender-appropriate way to Laura's confession of her love for Petrarch. This *Trionfo* reviews the poet's love for her, explains why she had appeared aloof, and recounts her astounding avowal. As he now realizes, Laura's death has liberated him from bondage to the flesh. He did not know it then, but the only true freedom is one consonant with divine *caritas:*

> Nessun di servitù già mai si dolse
> né di morte, quant'io di libertate,
> e de la vita, ch'altri non mi tolse.
> (*Trionfo della morte* 1.136–38)[23]
>
> None was ever grieved so much for servitude,
> Even for death, as I for liberty,
> And that my life was not now ta'en from me.
> (Wilkins trans.)

Mary Sidney's *Triumph* curiously alters the tense of this passage. In ways not earlier achieved by the young Elizabeth Tudor's translation of the *Trionfo della eternità* into fairly stiff quatrains or by Henry Parker, Lord Morley's *The Tryumphes of Frauncis Petrarcke* (published in 1554 perhaps as part of Mary Tudor's effort to arrange a marriage for Elizabeth), it also invests Petrarch's use of the word *libertade* with its echoes of Christian freedom and noble privilege.[24] Here is Sidney's translation:

> None so his thralle, as I my libertie;
> None so his death, as I my life doe rue,
> Staying with me, who faine from it would flye.
> (1.136–38)

Petrarch's past definite *si dolse* and *mi tolse* become the present continuous *doe rue* and *faine would flye,* underscoring a reciprocity between Laura's and the speaker's attitudes toward moral freedom.[25] The alteration emphasizes Petrarch's sense of gradual disclosure and self-revelation as a temporal and progressive act. Its implications for contrasting life and liberty to thralldom and death are important, as we shall see.

In the climactic lines of the *Trionfo della morte 2* Laura reveals that Petrarch's ardor drove her to an extreme reaction. She loved him almost as much as he loved her (here the discreet *quasi* [almost] conspicuously qualifies her avowal), but her virtue saved both of them from opprobrium:

> Fur quasi equali in noi fiamme amorose,
> almen poi ch'i' m'avidi del tuo foco;
> ma l'un le palesò, l'altro l'ascose.
> (2.139–41)

> The flames of love burned almost equally
> In us, after I knew the fire in thee:
> But one of us revealed them, one did not.
> (Wilkins' trans.)

In Sidney's translation the omission of *quasi* (almost) puts Laura exactly on Petrarch's level. In the new figure of a trial ("our hearts were tryde") she saves both herself and him from public condemnation by blocking his advances:

> In equale flames our louing hearts were tryde,
> At leaste when once thy loue had notice gott,
> But one to shewe, the other sought to hyde.
> (2.139–41)

All the while Laura recognizes that her response cannot deter Petrarch's true and honest love: "Per fictïon non cresce il ver, né scema" 'For no pretense greatens or lessens truth.' Mary Sidney's rendition of *fictïon* as a rhetorical literary term, *fiction,* links Laura's control of affect and emotion to the artfully fashioned verse in which the poet speaks: "Through fiction, Truth will neither ebbe nor flowe" (2.147).

At this point the avowal reaches an ambiguous conclusion:

> Ma non si ruppe almen ogni vel, quando
> soli i tuo' detti, te presente, accolsi,
> 'Dir più non osa il nostro amor' cantando?
> (2.148–50)

> But was not every veil between us rent
> When in thy presence I received thy verse,
> Singing, "Our love dares not say more than this"?
> (Wilkins' trans.)

Here the participle *cantando* may refer syntactically to the last explicit pronoun before the reported clause, "te presente," pointing to Petrarch as Laura addresses him. In this case Laura would be saying that she had come upon the poet while he was singing the words of a song, "dir più non osa il nostro amor" 'our love dares not say more than this.' In another scenario, however, *cantando* might refer to the implied subject of *accolsi,* Laura herself. In this case she would be saying that Petrarch had come upon her while she was singing one of his verses, the words of a song that he earlier composed. Sixteenth-century commentators are divided on the issue.

Gesualdo endorses the former reading, but he admits that the latter is a possibility: "Altri dicono che quando sola ella si staua cantando una Canzone" 'Others say that when she was alone, she began singing a song' (viii^{r}). Vellutello, however, identifies the referent of *cantando* (singing) with Laura. Alone in her chamber the beloved is singing to herself: "M. L. sola & da se stessa cantasse, al proposito di lui, una Canz. il cui principio in quella lingua sonaua, Dir piu non osa il nostro amore" 'Alone and by herself Laura sang, about him, a song whose beginning sounded in these words, "Our love dares not say more than this"'(e3^{r}). As Laura articulates her song, she claims a power of self-determination that gives voice to her own perspective on love. Mary Sidney evidently understands this difficult text in such a sense when she translates it:

> But clear'd I not the darkest mists of yore?
> when I thy words alone did entretaine

> Singing for thee? my loue dares speake no more.
> (2.148–50)

At this point several commentators recall Ovid's myth of Byblis. Vellutello, for example, tries to relate "dir più non osa il nostro amor" to Petrarch's larger corpus. In his estimation it refers to canzone 23, and its specific verses recall Byblis's letter averring her love for Caunus:

> Le vive voci m'erano interditte;
> Ond' io gridai con carta et con incostro:
> Non son mio, no. S'io moro, il danno è vostro
> (23.98–100)

> Words spoken aloud were forbidden me; so I cried out with paper and ink: "I am not my own, no; if I die, yours is the loss."

As Vellutello explains:

> Noi intendiamo, ch'egli intenda di quelli ch'egli disse in fine de la quinta stanza di quella Canzo. Nel dolce tempo de la prima etade, hauerle ecritto, Onde dice, Ond'io gridai con charta e con inchiostro, Non so mio non, s'io moro il danno e vostro. (e3r)
>
> We understand that he refers to what she said he wrote at the end of the fifth stanza of the canzone "In the sweet time of my first age," in which he declares, "so I cried out with paper and ink: 'I am not my own, no; if I die, yours is the loss.'"

Here Byblis's incestuous impulses come into play as a matter not of sexual desire but of Laura's pious commitment. Petrarch's avowal of pain is significant because in sonnet 224 his speaker repeats it using the same words but in a transposed order and with reversed valuation: "Vostro, Donna, 'l peccato et mio fia 'l danno" 'Yours will be the blame, Lady, mine the loss.' Either way the result is the same: Laura's radical virtue and unyielding chastity locates her in a class by herself.

The allusion to Byblis's incestuous desire for Caunus becomes a site for Petrarch's crisis of multiple identity in canzone 23 and for Laura's self-revelations in the *Trionfo della morte.* For Mary Wroth's fictional Pamphilia, a queen who commands a nation for which she bears responsibility, the same figure resonates with a sociocultural valence. She and Amphilanthus move through the narrative as shadowy analogues of the author and her lover-cousin, relating the account to biographical circumstance. By scriptural standards that prohibit no union between first cousins, her attraction to Amphilanthus (or Wroth's to Herbert) violates no law, but it does raise questions about the universality of

laws and the constancy of human nature. It productively averts the taboo of ingenerate incest by figuring a positive corporate siblinghood that nurtures the self-identity of the nation.

Pamphilia's merging of her wish for autonomy with her incorporation into a larger community as queen of Morea finds its introverted analogue in the story of Narcissus, and it follows that sonnet 46, first series (P53), "Love, thou hast all, for now thou hast mee made," explores this myth with scriptural echoes as a counterpoint. In it Wroth's heroine addresses Love as a deity, becoming Love's priestess in a semantic shift in which *ordained* means both "consecrated to the service of organized religion" and "destined or determined by fate":

> Love, thou hast all, for now thou hast mee made
> Soe thine, as if for thee I were ordain'd;
> Then take thy conquest, nor lett mee bee pain'd
> More in thy sunn, when I doe seeke thy shade.

Although she has tried to escape this surrender, Pamphilia now accedes to it in hopes of finding some relief from the flames of love. She presumes that it will temper her passion. Of course it won't, as she finds in the next quatrain, when she feels her "paine increase." In the sestet the fever leads her to a well "by love afresh imbrac'd." She now seems ripe for a narcissistic encounter with her own image, "When hott and thirsty to a well I came / Trusting by that to quench part of my flame." She is vulnerable not only to Love—"Butt ther I was by love afresh imbrac'd"—but also to a need for self-approval after being spurned by Amphilanthus. No longer prey to the ordinance of Byblis, she may yet fall prey to the vice of Narcissus.

Wroth's development of the Narcissus motif recalls Petrarch's sonnet 45, "Il mio adversario in cui veder solete" 'My adversary in whom you are wont to see,' especially as Petrarch's sixteenth-century commentators variously interpreted the Italian model. There Laura's fascination with her image in the mirror, the speaker's *adversario,* spells out positive as well as negative consequences of self-love. Although Brucioli and Daniello offer disapproving interpretations of this narcissism as a particularly female vice, one that is tolerated in beautiful women as a compensation for social restrictions imposed upon them, both Gesualdo and Castelvetro offer affirmative glosses.[26] Gesualdo understands it as the first stage of self-knowledge, "il conoscer se stesso" 'self-knowledge,' which is "il principio di sauere e di uirtute" 'the beginning of knowledge and virtue' (lxii^{v}). By gazing at her own reflected image, Laura comes to understand that her physical beauty is only a shadow. An initial act of self-regard leads to a deepening of self-awareness, a cognitive reawakening that stimulates

virtue. Likewise, for Castelvetro the recognition of self-love marks a preliminary stage of moral awakening that empowers both lover and beloved. Laura is a worthy object of Petrarch's devotion because she already loves herself and is "degni amante di voi medesima" 'worthy to be a lover of yourself' (99). The beloved's self-sufficiency motivates the lover's self-sacrifice.

In Wroth's poem the narcissistic moment brings her to a positive encounter with Love. Her reflected image deters her from drinking the waters of self-absorption, and it also attracts the God of Love, who begins to work upon enhancing her image:

> Drinke I could nott, butt in itt I did see
> My self a living glass as well as shee
> For love to see him self in truly plac'd.

Here Pamphilia inverts the Petrarchan topos in two ways. Instead of limiting her gaze to herself, she extends it to the God of Love, thereby inviting the participation of an outside agent; and, instead of retreating to an image of her own beauty in the water, she becomes a mirror for the God of Love to project his image. To him she becomes a human embodiment of all those virtues that constitute love. To the extent that this deity takes satisfaction in such a "living glass," however, it is he, not she, who displays narcissism. Pamphilia thus displaces onto a male figure the kind of self-love that Brucioli and Daniello attribute to female behavior.

As a surrogate for the beloved, the God of Love exemplifies the self-absorption of all those Petrarchan lovers who have exalted themselves before their mistresses. Pamphilia achieves a measure of transcendence and self-realization by questioning this self-absorption. She sees herself as "a living glass" that reflects her virtues "as well as she"—as vividly embodied, that is, as the flesh-and-blood woman who enacts them in real life. As a transitional space between the other's presence and her own autonomous selfhood, her living glass becomes a nurturing ground for self-identity. Here the paradigm of St. John's Gospel, "loue one another, as I haue loued you," initiates a reciprocal action (15.12). In sonnet 46 Pamphilia fulfills this command when she becomes a repository of Love, a mirror "for love to see him self in truly placed."[27]

In the final pages of the First Part of *Urania* Amphilanthus comes upon Pamphilia by accident as she lies weeping tears into a stream. The setting evokes Ovidian myths of watery transformation, while its concluding action revokes their negative consequences. Amphilanthus prepares to drink waters from the stream: "Hee saw her not, but seeing the dainty streame alighted to drinke of it" (First Part 557). Imbibing her tears, he absorbs her constancy:

"The water he dranke being mixed with her teares, had so infused constancy and perfect truth of loue in it, as in him it had wrought the like effect." Having become one like her, Amphilanthus initiates a move to become one with her in marriage. In the text's last complete sentence "*Amphilanthus* must goe, but intreates *Pamphilia* to goe as far as *Italy* with him, to visit the matchles Queene his mother" (558). This attempt comes undone. Not only do they not marry before the text breaks off, but even the manuscript continuation frustrates its consummation. There Pamphilia's father engages her to the king of Tartaria after dissolving her union with Amphilanthus (Second Part 270–78). She reluctantly submits to this arrangement, but she never renounces her affection for her former lover.

The meaning of *personal* in this context goes beyond any merely individual or egoistic sense of self. Pamphilia's analogies with Byblis in sonnet 44 and with Narcissus in sonnet 46 put her in touch with her own absorptive energies, and their accommodation to Scripture allows her to work through issues binding her to family, kin, and community. In each case Pamphilia comes to embrace a group identity larger than herself. Her public legal commitment to her royal lineage supersedes her private affective commitment to an amatory relationship. Unlike many of her counterparts in earlier Petrarchan poetry, she resists a narcissistic involvement with herself. Family, kin, and community afford Pamphilia a transcendent Otherness that mitigates the hazards of self-love, on the one hand, and of real or imagined incest, on the other. In this way she transmutes both narcissism and incest into the beginnings of self-knowledge and an engagement with the larger polity. As queen of Morea, she gives herself to her people, both the local and regional subjects whom she rules and the far-off supralocal, supraregional ones as well, contributing, like her prototype Elizabeth, to a new ideology of nation as a corporate siblinghood.[28]

The interiority of Petrarchan poetry becomes a staging ground for this commitment. Such interiority permits individuals to imagine themselves at least provisionally apart from the structures of family or kin, profession or trade, rank or status, with which they routinely identify. It enables them to think of themselves as active and autonomous persons with distinct inner lives. At the same time it redirects their shared political commitments to a new cause. Here in the hollow of an interior life where time and space are radically compressed, a person might extend such customary totemic allegiances from smaller communities to overlapping larger ones, from amatory and domestic loyalties to a version of social contract based on wider patterns of interpersonal affiliation.[29] He or she might transcend allegiances to family or kin, profession or

trade, or even rank and status and invest them in a larger community, a greater locale or region, a comprehensive nation or state of which he or she is part.

Instead of impounding the heroine in solitude, Petrarchan interiority lends her a vehicle that transports her to a heightened sense of social solidarity. Just as Laura had led Petrarch to salvation through her unyielding virtue, so Pamphilia will lead her beloved. But, whereas Petrarch's regeneration was deeply personal and intensely private, that of Wroth's lovers will have an impact on the public and political world that they inhabit and rule. As queen of her own kingdom, Pamphilia will inspire her beloved to virtue in governing the Holy Roman Empire. Their joint virtue will inspire all who depend upon them, their subjects in differing degrees of rank and status from lowest to highest, as their example forms the bedrock of their respective nations. As sister and brother rather than as lover and beloved—though not wholly released from the erotic power that has brought them together and charged their incestuous relationship—Pamphilia and Amphilanthus will turn the taboo of incest into a productive figure of national siblinghood.

Nurtured by her debt to an earlier generation of Sidneys, Mary Wroth's sense of political concordance betokens new ideas about the compressed space enveloping her world. In this space once remote localities were becoming mutually dependent, reciprocally interactive communities. The era of European exploration and colonization which had begun a century and a quarter before the publication of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* hatched new visions of long-distance nationhood and new forms of totemic identification with the geopolitical sites that they occupy. Spain led the way with its establishment of Nueva España in 1521 and, for its colonizers, the concomitant of transporting their Spanish sentiments across miles of ocean and uncharted territory. In his memoirs of Cortés' efforts to conquer Mexico from 1519 to 1521, Bernal Díaz describes the site of Montezuma's capital, strange and wonderful, in terms familiar to European readers, "like an enchanted vision from the tale of Amadis," with an open square "bigger I think than the plaza at Salamanca" and canals like those in Venice.[30] France followed with its plans to establish a Nouvelle France in North America, a sporadic and less orderly endeavor than the Spanish enterprise in South and Central America and one impelled by the rationale of consigning to far-off outposts religious rebels, cultural nonconformists, and social undesirables rejected by the motherland. Their survival, as Marguerite de Navarre writes in story 67 of the *Heptameron,* proves only that "God is almighty to nourish His servants in the barren desert."[31] This model of pragmatic extradition might well have motivated Philip Sidney's interest in

such New World ventures as part of a solution to social problems generated by conflicting sentiments about religion, class, and national identity in England.[32]

English colonizers, late starters in the New World race, had much to learn from their Continental forerunners, especially after the disastrous Jamestown venture in 1607. They would especially embrace the idea of a transportable national sentiment, one that could survive the passage of a voyage across the Atlantic and an implantation upon a new continent. In December 1620, seven months before the entry of *Urania* in the Stationers' Register, separatist Puritans arrived at Plymouth Rock. Exiled in Holland since 1608 and yearning to practice English ways of life which their exile denied, they reasoned that emigration to the Virginia colony would allow them to resume an English identity far from the religious persecution and political oppression in their place of birth.[33] Just as their experience of exile nourished their sentiments about the homeland from which they were separated, so it fueled their attachment to the new community that they had established.[34] Mary Wroth, it would seem, had already mobilized an analogous sentiment about her Sidneian past, and she called upon it to shape her attitudes toward the nation in which she was now living.

The site upon which Wroth exercises her imagination is Petrarchan poetry and narrative romance. Directed especially toward women and young readers, her writing exemplifies the qualities of self-discipline, refinement, and national sentiment honored in the new polity. The armature of Petrarchan style provides a ground for this display. In Wroth's lyric voice the exilic longings of Petrarch's poetry are transmuted into an expression of totemic allegiance to the Sidney family's achievements and to the nation that their family served. This poetic discourse—shaped and molded by socially valorized tenets of courtly Petrarchism—plays an important role in facilitating Wroth's expression of English sentiment. It offers a particular style, a studied manner, a cultivated way of speaking and writing, as a discursive paradigm for the ruling elite, a cultural vernacular that supplements the stark administrative idiolect.[35] The constructed quality of Wroth's Petrarchan style draws upon the hybridity of the English language's mixed identity and exploits its French, Germanic, and Latinate features. It registers the sentiments of a social hierarchy inscribed forty years earlier in Philip Sidney's *Defence,* sustained both in his belletristic writings and in Mary Sidney's literary translations. In the process *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* instantiates a conception of what the English people had become and what, as a ruling class, its elite could accomplish for the emergent nation. Such was the series of delicate transactions with the Petrarchan model which the Sidney family had negotiated and which Mary Wroth kept in circulation.

Conclusion

Far Sites, Father Sites, Farther Sites

The diversity of interests among early modern commentators on the *Rime sparse* had reaped a rich harvest. The loyalty of Antonio da Tempo, Francesco Filelfo, and Girolamo Squarzafico to the sovereign courts of northern Italy focused their attention on Petrarch's attitudes toward Ghibelline ideals. The historicizing efforts of Vellutello gave perspective to Petrarch's residence in southern France and northern Italy and to his frequent travels throughout Europe and the Empire. The rhetorical approaches of Gesualdo, Sylvano da Venafro, and Bernardino Daniello located Petrarch within ancient and early modern culture as one who processed and absorbed classical, Christian, medieval, and contemporaneous thought on politics, society, and art. The proto-Protestant sympathies of Fausto da Longiano, Antonio Brucioli, and Castelvetro finally attributed to Petrarch a resistance to the universalism of papal Christendom and a forecast of the particularisms of would-be national states emerging in sixteenth-century Europe.

The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe that received Petrarch's *Rime sparse* with this commentary was animate with varying forms of national sentiment, particularly among the ruling elite and the merchant and professional classes increasingly exposed to foreign contacts. Less than a decade before Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,* John Barclay (1582–1621), a Scottish nobleman who aspired under James I to an ambassadorship in France, published a Latin essay on the attributes of different nations in Europe, *Icon Animorum* (1614, translated into French as *L'Examen des esprits* in 1617 and from French into English as *The Mirror of Minds* in 1633). Its argument pro-

ceeds from the assumption "that there is a proper Spirit to every Region, which doth in a manner shape the studies and manners of the Inhabitants" (26).[1] By assembling such loci of national differences, Barclay hopes to provide a rhetorical handbook for fellow diplomats to assess the temperaments of their foreign counterparts, "then from the Genius of diuers Nations to bee so informed, as to know how to behaue our selues in different countries, and what from euery place to expect or feare" (40).

The *Icon* deepens a rhetorical inventory of cross-cultural comparisons formed by such ancients as Herodotus and Tacitus and such early moderns as Ravisus Textor, whose *Specimen epithetorum* (1518) characterizes older societies; Baldassare Castiglione, whose *Book of the Courtier* (1528) offers *obiter dicta* on contemporaneous Italian, French, and Spanish differences; Juan Huarte, whose *Examen de los ingenios* (1575) appraises Spain's geography, climate, and temperamental humors; Jean Bodin, whose *Republic* (1575) tabulates the attributes of other modern nations in similar terms; and Michel de Montaigne, whose *Journal of a Voyage to Italy* (1580–81) compares French and Italian idiosyncrasies and relates them to those of other peoples in the ancient and sixteenth-century worlds. Barclay's *Icon* arranges such topics for practical use, pausing not for a single moment to doubt the Germans' "loue of drinking" (107), the Italians' "obsequiousnesse and curtesie" (147), the Spaniards' "supercilious pride" (165), and the Turks' "rustike and base nature, not worthy of liberty" (208).[2] Its publication in Latin, French, and English attests to the grip of national stereotypes upon the European imagination.[3]

Most of Barclay's discussion would have surprised Petrarch. In the latter's lifetime, only France, of all the emerging nation-states considered in this book, displayed any recognizable sense of corporate identity. As a noncontiguous kingdom that embraced chiefly the Île de France, Normandy, Touraine, Limousin, and parts of Languedoc, it bore only a shadowy resemblance to today's hexagon. But the French monarchy had long thought of itself as an administrative entity ruling with unbroken continuity since the sixth century, when Clovis imposed his rule on the Paris basin, and French people thought of themselves as a collectivity, despite social, cultural, ethnic, and historical differences among them. Spain fixed its unity in the second half of the fifteenth century, when the Castilian and Aragonese kingdoms combined and expelled from Iberia Jewish and Islamic *extranjeros.* England, despite the unarguable demarcation of its insular boundaries and, since the eleventh century, the endurance of its Plantagenet monarchy, was a patchwork of feuding baronies in intermittent civil war until the Tudors stabilized the kingdom. States on the

northern and eastern borders of Europe such as Denmark, Sweden, and Russia had longer histories of administrative continuity than England, while Portugal had a longer-lived monarchy than Spain, but none of them attained the degree of national sentiment displayed in Spain, France, or England.[4]

In the lifetimes of Lorenzo de' Medici and Cariteo a century after Petrarch and of Du Bellay and the Sidneys in the next century, sentiments about Italy as a nation-state would have been inconceivable. Not only was it divided into zones of well-organized principalities, republics, papal territories, kingdoms, and autonomous city-states, some of which were ruled by France and Spain, but its people seemed intent on perpetuating regional differences and rivalries among themselves, not the least through (to this day) a bewildering variety of dialects and local accents. In Germany the major impediment to a centralized *Reich* came from a congeries of some three hundred poorly organized secular and ecclesiastical lordships, eighty-five imperial cities, and seven imperial electorates.[5] The spirit of a headstrong but diffuse *Volk* spawned little national sentiment.[6] In 1455 Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini had revived Tacitus' long-forgotten *Germania* in order to mobilize German feelings into a crusade against the Turks.[7] In 1492 Jacob Wimpheling appealed to Teutonic distinctiveness as a mark of solidarity against Louis XI's designs on Alsatian frontiers. Other overtures included Conrad Celtis's *Germania Generalis* (1500), with its mythology about the northern Druids as a race driven from its native Greece by the emperor Tiberius, and Ulrich von Hutten's address to the Augsburg Diet (1518), with its representation of the first-century warrior Arminius (Hermann) as a liberator of Germania.[8] A powerful summons to German self-consciousness came from Martin Luther's reformist measures against the hegemonic Latin culture of Rome.[9]

The spiritual sonnets of Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg (1633–94) illustrate the fate of this German sentiment a century and a half later. Von Greiffenberg was a noblewoman from Lower Austria who in 1663 emigrated to Nuremberg for social, political, and religious reasons. She had been born into Protestant nobility in 1633 near Amsetten, midway between Vienna and Linz, a predominantly, even militantly, Catholic region during the Thirty Years War (1618–48).[10] The Treaty of Westphalia that closed the war marked a defeat for the Hapsburg Empire and the papacy, the end of a world universalized by them, and the rise of diverse national interests competing in their place.[11] It diminished the power of church and clergy, amplified the power of princes and barons, and further particularized the various states of Germany. Above all it ended the illusion that Europe was a single Christian empire, governed spir-

itually by the pope and temporally by the Holy Roman emperor as Dante and Petrarch hoped for in their day. The reality of Europe as a heterogeneous society had taken root. Von Greiffenberg was fifteen years old at the time of the treaty. After the death of her younger sister three years later, she devoted her life to God and the Protestant cause, and in her early twenties she wrote some 250 religious sonnets in the Petrarchan mode to prove the point. They were published in Nuremberg in 1662, along with a hundred other poems in various meters, no doubt selected from a much larger body of poetry that she had produced by the age of twenty-nine.

The circumstances of their publication as *Geistliche Sonnette* (1662) bears upon von Greiffenberg's social position. The poet lived with her mother and her father's half-brother Hans Rudolf, who became her guardian when her father died during her childhood. This half-uncle paid for her education in Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, and eventually Hebrew and Greek, so that she was able to read Petrarch and Scripture in their original languages. In early 1662 her uncle contacted the most famous publisher in Nuremberg to arrange for the printing of her poetry. The reason is palpable. He wanted to marry her. He might have been madly in love, or perhaps, as members of the Protestant minority in a predominantly Catholic territory, he simply lacked other suitable spousal partners.[12] In any event he was twenty-six years older than her, and she recoiled from the prospect. When he threatened to convert to Roman Catholicism if she refused, she relented at once. The taboo of incest must have seemed less fearsome than the creedal conflicts that had thwarted German national unity.

Von Greiffenberg stood by her uncle-husband when he was thrown into jail for shady business dealings a year later, and when he died a decade later—their marriage was without children—she mourned him as a virtuous widow. She then moved permanently to Nuremberg, where she lived without remarrying and published devotional essays interspersed with poetic prayers and thoughtful interpretations of scriptural passages. Her sense of attachment to Nuremberg, an Imperial City that since the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 had tolerated both Protestant and Catholic creeds, seems more an expression of her internationalist literary sensibility than of any national sentiment. There Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen's contemporaneous *Der abenteuerliche Simplicissimus* (1669, printed at Nuremberg by Felszecher) parodied an evident vogue for Philip Sidney's pastoral romance (translated partly by Martin Opitz) as its newly ennobled hero devotes himself to hunting, amatory pursuits, and reading "the incomparable *Arcadia,* from which I sought to learn eloquence . . .

[but which] taught me, instead of eloquence, to practice lechery."[13] A reader such as von Greiffenberg would rather draw from the Protestant Sidney the moral fervor ratified in his work by his niece Mary Wroth.

Von Greiffenberg came to Nuremberg when its Lutheran elite was seeking a cultural bond that might relate it to Germany's Protestant Hanseatic, Saxon, and Silesian centers.[14] In Nuremberg the middle-class convergence of courtly Hofweise modes of verse with still popular late medieval Meistersinger styles of poetry (exemplified preeminently by Hans Sachs a century and a half earlier) produced a remarkable efflorescence of theory and practice. Justus Georg Schottel in *Teutsche Vers-oder Reim Kunst* 'Art of German Verse or Rhyme' (1645) and in *Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen Haubt Sprache* 'Introductory Work on the Chief German Dialect' (1663) exalted the merits of German as an original language, primal since Babel, not descended from a decayed Latin as were the Romance tongues.[15] Indebted to Schottel, the patrician Philipp Harsdörffer launched a periodical, the *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* 'Dialogues in the Ladies' Salon' (1641–57), and wrote a manual of poetics, the *Poetischer Trichter* 'Poetic Funnel' (1647). With Johann Klaj and Sigmund von Birken he also established a literary society that connected with others throughout Germany, the *Blumenorden an der Pegnitz* 'Floral Society by the Pegnitz' (1644, named after the river that flows through Nuremberg), which evolved into the *Pegnisische Schäfferei* 'Pegnitz Shepherds.'[16] The poetry that they wrote is especially notable for its emphasis on musicality, metrical virtuosity, tonal brilliance, acoustic resonance, and onomatopoetic effects.[17] Von Greiffenberg brought her Protestant sensibility to this milieu and conjoined to it the technical facility of such poets as Simon Dach from Königsberg, Paul Fleming and Paul Gerhardt from Saxony, and Andreas Gryphius, Angelius Silesius, and Daniel Casper von Lohenstein from Silesia.[18] By 1677 von Greiffenberg was elected leader of the Lilienzunft society, the local branch of Philipp von Zesen's Hamburg-based Deutschgesinnte Genossenschaft, another pan-Germanic academy whose members kept in touch with one another through frequent correspondence.

The octave of the following sonnet by Greiffenberg announces its ties with Nuremberg theory and practice:[19]

> Ach lobe, lobe, lob ohne Unterlaß und Ziel
> Den, den zu loben du, o meine Seel, geboren!
> Zu diesen Engel-Werk bist du von Gott erkoren,
> Daß du ihm dienen sollst im Wunderpreisungs-Spiel.
> Das kleine Scherflein ihm von jenem Weib gefiel:

> Dein Einfalt klinget wohl in seinem Demut-Ohren.
> Er geht sanfmütig um mit dem zerbrochnen Rohren.
> Wie schwach und bebend auch, beliebt ihm doch dein
> Kiel.

> Praise, praise, praise without cease or limit Him whom you, o my soul, were born to praise. For these angel-tasks were you elected by God, that you should serve Him in the playful give-and-take of wonder's exaltation. The smallest mite from that woman pleased Him: your simplicity resounds nicely in His ears, open as they are to meekness. He deals gently with the crushed reeds. No matter how slender or quivering, your quill still pleases Him.

Reworking the opening of the Lord's Prayer, this poem expresses a deep religious sentiment in harmonious cadences compatible with the premises of Harsdörffer's and Klaj's poetic theory. Suggesting an increasingly upward movement of sound, the repetition of basslike *lobe* in the first line yields to modulated *e-u-o* vowels in the second line and to higher-pitched *ie, e,* and long *i* vowels that follow. The impression is of a seamless diatonic ascent toward consonance and serenity, not unlike that in the closing sonnets of Du Bellay's *Olive.* Protestant convictions inform von Greiffenberg's use of the word *erkoren* (elected) to designate the *Engel-Werk* 'angel-task' of praising God that is appointed to her, and they circumscribe her relations to the community—a Protestant community that defines its identity in terms of religious attachment.

Von Greiffenberg's poem recalls Petrarch's sonnet 62, "Padre del ciel" 'Father of heaven,' itself a concise reworking of the Lord's Prayer and striking because in Matthew 6.7 Jesus proposes this prayer in its plain and abbreviated style as a counter to the grandiloquent rhetoric of heathens: "Use no vaine repetitions [*nolite multum loqui*] as the heathen, for they think to be heard for their much babbling [*in multiloquio suo*]."[20] In this context von Greiffenberg displays her scriptural virtuosity but also a sense of poetic competition with Petrarch and those who have appropriated his style. In her poem there is no question of a tormented secular conscience such as Petrarch's. Certainly von Greiffenberg admits of no sexual impediment, nor does she allow the distraction of a human love, whether legitimate or adulterous, to intervene upon her contact with God. Her calling is to praise the Lord and to be a good Protestant reader of Scripture, as her echoes from the synoptic Gospels in lines 5 to 8 show, when she evokes the story of the widow's mite in Mark 12.41–44 and Luke 21.1–4 and the prophecy of Isaiah 42.1–4 as recounted in Matthew 12.20: "He will not break the crushed reed . . . till he has led the truth to victory."

The congregational sentiment exemplified by von Greiffenberg aspired to a transportability across Protestant Germany in much the same way that the Spanish sentiment of early European settlers in the New World of central Mexico and coastal Peru aspired to transportability across the Atlantic Ocean.[21] Called *Nueva España* because its colonists thought of themselves as Spaniards inhabiting lands claimed for the Crown, its domains underwent a rapid process of hybridization and new social formation.[22] By the seventeenth century the overextended Spanish monarchy, buffeted by the French, Dutch, and English, could no longer securely control its colonies, and so *criollo* settlers experienced new degrees of self-sufficiency and autonomy. Haciendas, great landed estates formed on Iberian models of land tenure and social status, generated a powerful class of local oligarchs who sometimes thought of themselves as quite distinct from their brethren in the mother country, spawning new sentiments about being in and belonging to the Americas.[23]

Into this world Sor Juana Inéz de la Cruz (1648–95) was born in the foothills of Popocatepetl as the illegitimate daughter of an upper-class *criolla* mother and an unidentified Basque father. At the age of twenty-one, after some years at the viceregal court in Mexico City, where she had served as lady-in-waiting to the viceroy's daughter, she entered a Hieronymite convent. Here for importunate visitors from court she wrote several volumes of *comedias* and *autos sacramentales* in the style of Calderón, lyrics of various genres in the style of Góngora, and sixty-six sonnets on philosophical, mythological, religious, amatory, encomiastic, and satirical themes in the styles of Lope de Vega and Quevedo.[24] A famous letter in reply to a reprimand from the archbishop of Mexico City, a "Response to the Most Illustrious Poetess Sor Filotea de la Cruz," the latter a pseudonym for her benefactor, the bishop of Puebla, presents a self-defense against misogynistic attacks on her intellectual interests. An impressive catalog of European arts and sciences useful for interpreting Scripture and worthy of pursuit in their own right accompanies an equally impressive enumeration of European women who devoted themselves to such studies in ancient and early modern times. Sor Juana inserts herself into this largely Iberian, deeply European culture as though her life in a Mexico City convent were commensurate with a life in Spain. Consonant with much of her writing, the letter betrays no sentiment about being distant or detached from the mother country.[25]

Sor Juana's writing reveals her fascination with Mexican distinctiveness, paradoxically regarded as a mirror of Spanish and European identity. In the *loa* for an *auto sacramental* entitled *El divino Narciso,* an allegorical personage of Christian religion looks into the reflecting pond of Aztec religion, personi-

fied as La América, and finds there a likeness of her own concept of God and moral values. La América staunchly proclaims her independence against colonizing Europeans, "sin dejar que advenedizas / Naciones, osadas quieran / intentar interrumpirlas" 'our rituals shall not be banned / by these Nations, still unknown, / so newly come unto our land (386/211).[26] Religion, acknowledging the syncretic ties that link Aztec concepts to Christian ones, deters Zeal from attacking the former, "que a especies intelectivas / ni habrá distancias que estorben / ni mares que les impidan" 'for men of reason realize / there is no distance that deftly deters, / nor seas that interchange efface' (390/235). The world in Sor Juana's imagination is a cognate whole, in which Aztec beliefs totemically mirror Christian ones, but still Sor Juana fixes for herself a distinctly Mexican version of her identity. Her sense of being a *criolla* in and of Mexico with a specific Mexican character has spurred such modern authors as Octavio Paz, José Lezama Lima, and Gabriela Mistral to regard her as an early emblem of Latin American literature writ large.[27]

In the extensive corpus of Sor Juana's poetry twenty-one amatory sonnets represent a late flowering of Petrarchism in the Spanish Americas, as exemplified by the following:

> Detente, sombra de mi bien esquivo,
> imagen del hechizo que más quiero,
> bella ilusión por quien alegre muero,
> dulce ficción por quien penosa vivo.
> Si al imán de tus gracias, atractivo,
> sirve mi pecho de obediente acero,
> ¿para qué me enamoras lisonjero
> si has de burlarme luego fugitivo?
>
> Mas blasonar no puedes, satisfecho,
> de que triunfa de mí tu tiranía:
> que aunque dejas burlado el lazo estrecho
> que tu forma fantástica ceñía,
> poco importa burlar brazos y pecho
> si te labra prisión mi fantasía.

Stay, shadow of contentment too short lived, / illusion of enchantment I most prize, / fair image for whom happily I die, / sweet fiction for whom painfully I live. / If answering your charms' imperative, / compliant, I like steel to magnet fly, / by what logic do you flatter and entice, / only to flee, a taunting fugitive? / 'Tis no triumph that you so smugly boast / that I fell victim to your tyranny; / though from encircling bonds that held you fast / your

elusive form too readily slipped free, / and though to my arms you are forever lost, / you are a prisoner in my fantasy.

The poem prominently replicates familiar Petrarchan figures of the flatterer (*lisonjero*), the tight snare (*el lazo estrecho*), tyranny (*tu tiranía*), and the nocturnal phantasm (*tu forma fantástica*), but it sets them in strangely different contexts activated through paradox, irony, wordplay, and hyperbole. Its dominant figure is inscribed in its final word, *fantasía,* whose Petrarchan pedigree may be traced to sonnet 212 in the *Rime sparse.* The speaker of this poem marks twenty years of "grave et lungo affanno" 'heavy, long labor' in falling for "l'ésca et l'amo" 'the bait and the hook' of Love:

> Beato in sogno et di languir contento,
> d'abbracciar l'ombre et seguir l'aura estiva,
> nuoto per mar che non á fondo o riva;
> solco onde, e 'n rena fondo, et scrivo in vento.

Blessed in sleep and satisfied to languish, to embrace shadows and pursue the summer breeze, I swim through a sea that has no floor or shore, I plow the waves and found my house on sand and write on the wind.

Vellutello and Gesualdo offer relevant glosses. By cross-referring the poem to sonnet 181, "Amor fra l'erbe una leggiadra rete" 'Love set out amid the grass a gay net,' Vellutello puts it into a narrative context just before Laura's death. Petrarch is visiting Laura at Cabrières for the last time before embarking for Parma, where a few months later he learns that she has died. In this account Petrarch's frustrated longing renders the cliffs of Vaucluse and the Rhone Valley desolate, "per non esser in quello alcuna vera beatitudine, ma solamente illusioni e errori" 'because no real happiness occurs here, but only illusions and mistakes' (85^{v}). Conversely, Gesualdo locates the poem upon a map of poetic allusion which begins with the Florentine proverb "beato in sogno," which Gesualdo glosses as "che nulla vale" 'an out-and-out delusion' (234^{r}), and extends through echoes of Pindar, Plato, Democritus, Cicero, Tibullus, Christian theology, Arnaut Daniel, Dante, and Petrarch himself. Whether in the concrete historical space of Vellutello's narrative or in the intertextual chambers of Gesualdo's literary imagination, the poem situates its author as one with multiple allegiances to a geopolitical world and to a world of thought and local sentiment.

Sor Juana's poetry reflects at a distance the courtly manners of Mexico City's viceregal government, while her "Response to Sor Filotea" conveys her willing embrace of the convent as a site where she would have "no obligatory

occupation that would inhibit the freedom of my studies" (831/17).[28] Inside the convent with her books and her poetic imagination she could be anywhere and everywhere at once and always most profoundly in the stream of European intellectual discourse. Likewise, any *criollos* or *criollas* in baronial haciendas of New Spain could imagine themselves as noble lords or ladies in the Old World, connecting their sentiments to ways of life in the mother country. Conversely, they could see themselves as oligarchs in the New World, grounding their sentiments in a distinctly emerging American consciousness.[29] For them the vastness of Mexico could and did represent a new Rome, settled by diverse ethnic groups as ancient Rome had been, colonized not by the survivors of Troy but by the latter's Hispanic descendants, who now governed territories formerly part of the Aztec empire.[30] As ancient Rome ceded its totems and taboos to a Christian order, so would ancient Mexico. Out of their shared experiences grew a bond of solidarity between the Spanish-speaking colonists and the non-Spanish-speaking Amerindians—a sense of community without linguistic, cultural, or ethnic unity but with a recognition of common political interest and of exceptionalism amid hybridity.[31]

This sense of divided identity, of allegiance to competing zones, even of exile from a primal site of origin, has deep roots in Petrarch's political imagination, where fantasy summons the collective energies of a cultural and historical awareness. Casting a distinctively public and patriotic emphasis upon the lover's anguished estrangement from Laura, such commentators as Vellutello and Gesualdo remark about the burden of the poet's many travels. Vellutello thinks of his diplomatic missions to "duri genti et costumi" 'hard peoples and customs' (canzone 360.48) as efforts to escape from Love, "per fuggirsi e liberarsi dal giogo d'amore" 'to flee and to free himself from Love' (121^{v}). The figure of "mille lacciuoli" 'a thousand snares' (canzone 360.51) evokes Love's countereffforts to entrap the traveler, as Gesualdo explains: "mille impedimenti, che per lo camino incontrano" 'a thousand impediments that confront him, along the road' (334^{r}). The experience drives Petrarch to make statements that are phantasmic: "Mai notturno fantasma / d'error non fu sì pien" 'Never was a nocturnal phantasm so full of error' (canzone 360.131–32).

This figuration of *phantasma* dominates Sor Juana's poem, too, from the *sombra de mi bien* and *imagen del hechizo* of its opening lines to the concluding *forma fantástica* of its sestet. Liberated from the tyranny of a *satisfecho* oppressor (masculine gendered but ambiguously defined), her speaker evokes an idealized world of self-possession, in which the "sombra de mi bien" is no longer "esquivo" and every "bella illusión" and "dulce ficción" remains forever

"allegre." Sor Juana's poetry expresses a moment of productive tension in her culture when the power of a Petrarchan imagination breaks away from Petrarchistic efforts to stabilize a literary language and its modes of cultural production. This split figures strongly in the Jesuit program to valorize indigenous Amerindian languages at the expense of European languages—a program that the Crown and its agents resisted. While the Spanish monarchy saw its rule in the Americas as strengthened by teaching the Castilian dialect to the Amerindians and acculturating them through that medium as through a lingua franca, Jesuits such as José de Acosta prompted other forms of interdependence by using Aztec idioms as fit vehicles for evangelizing native Americans.[32] In the court of the Spanish viceroy in Mexico City the talents of Sor Juana offered *Criollos* a precious reserve of cultural capital. To the extent that this capital refers to totemic standards of the ancestral land beyond the sea, it might seem to express a nostalgia for European identity. But, to the extent that Sor Juana puts it at the service of a powerful imagination soaring across the boundaries of ancestry and descent, territory and cultural behavior, it might also express the opposite: the beginnings of a distinctive Spanish-American sentiment free from taboos of the Old World.

That Petrarchism had contributed to Sor Juana's style is indubitable, even though its powers had begun to wane before her birth. Earlier, however, they dominated European poetry. Petrarch himself had complained, disingenuously or not, that his *Rime sparse* were sung to his dismay everywhere "through the arcades . . . [and] at the street corners" (*Fam.* 21.15: 3.105/1130). Lorenzo de' Medici fashioned his own verse in the Petrarchan mode to mobilize a powerful segment of the Florentine populace and Cariteo fashioned his to impress powerful foreign rulers. Joachim Du Bellay advocated for a literary culture that would include the language of "not only the learned but also all kinds of workmen and mechanics" (*Deffence* 172/95). Mary Sidney published her brother Philip's writing to increase its circulation beyond Whitehall's or Wilton's "smally learned courtiers" (*Defence* 118), so that it might reach a wider readership in and around metropolitan London and perhaps among the rural gentry, a readership to which Mary Wroth aspired. By and large their poetry made its way through upper-class environments and appealed to upper-class sentiments.

The boundaries of this readership insured its totemic status among classes of people bound to one another with ties of loyalty and personal allegiance. This nucleus of readers would develop its own attitudes toward local or regional identity and its relationship to a national imaginary, and the social

prominence of these readers guaranteed that larger segments of the population would come to share vicariously in such sentiments. Concepts of nation, national identity, and national sentiment remain difficult to define and even more difficult to justify. They evolve out of a play of language and memory, character and conflict, history and accident, geography and design. Our own highly pressured age of sociological awareness and psychological self-consciousness analyzes them with a particular attachment to scientific rigor and precise terminology. Earlier ages lacked such nomenclature, but they did possess a poetic language that expressed convergent problems and issues, tensions and conflicts, dreams and aspirations, in powerfully nuanced formulations.

Among them the language of Petrarchan poetry achieved this goal. Originally a hybrid of classical and late medieval forms in northern Italy, Petrarchism offered a literary model for emergently national vernaculars soon to be codified throughout Europe. If its subsequent history foregrounds the rise of national sentiment, it does so partly because of issues at stake as it dramatizes interrelated ideas about friendship, sex, marriage, family, community, social class, gendered bodies, ruling hierarchies, and emerging state bureaucracies. Petrarch's fourteenth-century composite discourse came close to supplying a universal norm for poetic expression in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. Yet this same universalism everywhere conflicted with regional vernaculars and local identifications inscribed in consecutive imitations of the *Rime sparse.* In this context each reworking of Petrarchan discourse displays a palimpsest of social change, cultural adjustment, and political development, with attendant conflicts, tensions, and outright contradictions enacted in them. That, plus the permanently unfulfilled desire at the heart of Petrarchan lyric, made Petrarchism a powerful vehicle for expressing national sentiment in early modern Europe.

Notes

Introduction

1. See Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *Life of Petrarch* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 3–24.

2. See William J. Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); and Gino Belloni, *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo: Studi sul commento umanistico-rinascimentale al "Canzoniere"* (Padua: Antenore, 1992). For the social, cultural, and technological context of these commentaries, see Paolo Trovato, *Con ogni diligenza corretto: La stampa e le revisioni editoriali dei testi letterari italiani 1470–1570* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1991), pp. 121–63; for Petrarch's reform of book production providing impetus for such commentaries, see Armando Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture,* trans. Charles M. Radding (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 174–203; for Aldus Manutius' innovative edition of Petrarch's Italian poetry in 1501, see Brian Richardson, *Print Culture in Renaissance Italy: The Editor and the Vernacular Text, 1470–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 48–78; and, for the diversified reading public that received such commentaries in the sixteenth century, see Richardson, *Printers, Writers, and Readers in Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 107–57.

3. He entered the city only twice, each time for a few days of stopover flanking a visit to Rome in the Jubilee Year of 1350 (referred to in *Familiares* 11.1 and 11.5). On the first occasion (early October) he stayed with Boccaccio, attended to some family matters about confiscated property, and met several young scholars who showed him a longer text of Quintilian's *Institutes* than the one he had known, inspiring him upon his return to compose a letter to Quintilian dated from Florence in December (*Familiares* 24.7). See Wilkins, *Life,* pp. 99–102.

4. For Bembo, see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 82–113; Martin L. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation from Dante to Bembo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 249–74; and Maurizio Vitale, *La Questione della lingua* (Palermo: Palumbo, 1978), pp. 50–104. For Bembo's reception outside of Tuscany, see Paolo Trovato, *Storia della lingua italiana: Il primo Cinquecento* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994), pp. 75–123. For the role of anthologies in disseminating Petrarchism, see Amedeo Quondam, *Petrarchismo mediato: Per una critica della forma antologia* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974), pp. 215–50.

5. For Machiavelli's complex relationship to the Medici and the Republic of Florence, see John Najemy, *Between Friends: Discourses of Power and Desire in the Machiavelli-Vettori Letters of 1513–15* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 58–117, 197–214, and 241–53; Sebastian DeGrazia, *Machiavelli in Hell* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), pp. 145–56; and Maurizio Viroli, *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 56–62 and 73–113. For Bembo's influence on the literary vernacular, see Giancarlo Mazzacurati, *La questione della lingua dal Bembo all' accademia Fiorentina* (Naples: Liguori, 1965), pp. 109–24; and Pasquale Sabbatino, *L'idioma volgare: Il dibattito sulla lingua letteraria nel Rinascimento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1995), pp. 13–44 and 149–238.

6. For descriptive profiles, see Carlo Dionisotti, "La Fortuna del Petrarca nel '400," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 17 (1974): 61–113; Ezio Raimondi, "Francesco Filelfo interprete del Canzoniere," *Studi Petrarcheschi* 3 (1950): 143–64; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 36–45. For the analogous history of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century commentaries on Dante's work, see Deborah Parker, *Commentary and Ideology: Dante in the Renaissance* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), with a study of Filelfo on pp. 53–57.

7. For profiles, see Parker, *Commentary and Ideology,* pp. 119–21 and 196–97; Belloni, *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo,* pp. 58–88; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 45–52.

8. See profiles in Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 52–62; for Sylvano, see Sabbatino, *L'idioma volgare,* pp. 46–55; for Gesualdo, see Belloni, *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo,* pp. 190–219.

9. For profiles, see Parker, *Commentary and Ideology,* pp. 109–23; Ezio Raimondi, "Bernardino Daniello e le varianti petrarcheschi," *Studi Petrarcheschi* 5 (1952): 95–130; Belloni, *Laura tra Petrarca e Bembo,* pp. 226–83; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 62–67.

10. See profiles in Paolo Trovato, *Il primo Cinquecento,* pp. 49–55; Giorgio Spini, *Tra rinascimento e riforma: Antonio Brucioli* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1940), pp. 98–99 and 192–93; Ezio Raimondi, "Gli scrupoli di un filologo: Ludovico Castelvetro e il Petrarca," *Studi Petrarcheschi* 5 (1952): 131–210; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 67–81.

11. For nationalism as a transformation of consciousness enabled through communication technology, see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1981); for nationalism as providing a culture summoned by the industrialization process, see Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); for nationalism as a political program of polyethnic unification and expansion, see Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); for nationalism as a product of state growth and the latter's monopolization of military technology, see Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power,* vol. 1: *A History of Power from the Beginning to* A.D. *1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), esp. pp. 450–99; for nationalism

as a declaration of citizenship within the collective character of a society, see John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982).

12. For a sociological approach to this question, see Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992); for an ethnographic approach, see Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origin of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986); for a historical approach, see John Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); for a psychological approach of mass identification in relation to international politics, see William Bloom, *Personal Identity, National Identity, and International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 54–75; for interlocking psychological, ethical, and political claims embedded in national sentiment, see David Miller, *On Nationality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 17–47.

13. Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud,* trans. James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud, 24 vols. (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1953/66–1974), "Totem and Taboo," 13.1–162. For the political aspect of this myth in seventeenth-century drama in which the representation of guilt promotes social cohesion, see Mitchell Greenberg, *Canonical States, Canonical Stages: Oedipus, Others, and Seventeenth-Century Drama* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), xi–xxxix.

14. Freud, "Family Romances," *Standard Edition,* 9.235–44.

15. For the late-medieval transformation of agrarian Italy into administratively centralized urban states, see Philip Jones, *Economia e società nell'Italia medievale* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980), pp. 47–178; and Ovidio Capitano, ed., *Comuni e signorie: Istituzioni, società e lotte per l'egemonia* (Turin: UTET, 1981), esp. the contributions of Raoul Manselli, "Il sistema degli stati italiani dal 1250 al 1454," pp. 179–265; and Antonio Ivan Pini, "Dal comune città-stato al comune ente amministrativo," pp. 451–589. For specific examples, see Alberto Tenenti, *Stato: Un idea, una logica: Dal comune italiano all'assolutismo francese* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1987), esp. "La nozione di 'stato' nell'Italia del Rinascimento," pp. 53–97; and "Profilo e limiti delle relatà nazionali in Italia fra Quattrocento e Seicento," pp. 139–55; and essays in Julius Kirshner, ed., *The Origin of the State in Italy, 1300–1600* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), esp. the contributions of Giorgio Chittolini, "The 'Private,' the 'Public,' the 'State,'" pp. 34–61; and Elena Fasano Guarini, "Center and Periphery," pp. 74–96. For German territorial consolidation, see Otto Brunner, *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria,* trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992). For comparisons between Italian and German history, see Giorgio Chittolini and Dietmar Willoweit, *L'organizzazione del territorio in Italia e Germania, secoli XIII–XIV* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994).

16. For standardized state forms as a functional response to these conditions, see Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism;* for agency as a reactive response to change,

see Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780;* and Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State.* For collective solidarity as a product of vertical and lateral ethnic consciousness, see Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations,* pp. 21–91. For literary implications of social integration and political legitimization, see Walter Cohen, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theater in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 136–85; and Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1–14.

17. For biblical ideals of nationhood in Reformation political theory, see Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 1–34 and 185–209. For nationalist bearings of religious identification upon French cultural history, see Colette Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late Medieval France,* trans. Susan Ross Huston, ed. Fredric L. Cheyette (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). For implications in English literary history, see Clare MacEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590–1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 1–32.

18. For application to Italian history, see the territorial rivalries discussed in Sergio Bertelli, Nicolai Rubinstein, and C. H. Smyth, eds., *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations,* 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1979–80); and Bertelli, Rubinstein, and Smyth, eds., *Florence and Milan: Comparisons and Relations,* 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki 1989). For application to French literary history, see Tom Conley, *The Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); for application to English literary history, see Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

19. Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* esp. p. 30, drawing on Walter Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History, in *Illuminations,* trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1969), pp. 253–64.

20. For the ways in which literary texts register conflicts between different models of community in dialogic relationship with different and developing generic forms, see Timothy Hampton, *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century: Inventing Renaissance France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), esp. pp. 1–34.

21. For the responsiveness of the Petrarchan lyric to cultural upheavals and its correlation with gender and class conflict, absolutism, transatlantic imperialism, and other applications, see Roland Greene, *Unrequited Conquests: Love and Empire in the Colonial Americas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), pp. 135–70.

22. For patterns of differentiation in Petrarchan poetry which resemble distinctions between the self and the other and therefore suggest connections with problems of gender, artistic competition, and national pride among Petrarch's adherents and detractors, see Heather Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 15–56.

23. For cultural polemics initiated by the nationalistic implications of Petrarch's Latin writings and by the conception of history undergirding them, see Walter Stephens, *Giants in Those Days: Folklore, Ancient History, and Nationalism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), pp. 139–84.

24. Ernest Pulgram, *The Tongues of Italy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 19–20.

25. Pulgram, *Tongues of Italy,* pp. 134–236.

26. For a splendid survey of ideas about Italy from ancient Roman to early modern times, see Claudia Lazzaro, "Italy as a Garden: The Idea of Italy and the Italian Garden Tradition," in *Villas and Gardens in Early Modern Italy and France,* ed. Mirka Benes and Dianne Harris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 29–60, esp. pp. 37–39.

27. For the long evolution of Latin into the vernacular languages of Italy, see Pulgram, *Tongues of Italy,* pp. 402–20; Mario Pei, *The Italian Language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), pp. 138–61; Bruno Migliorini, *The Italian Language,* rev. trans. T. Gwynfor Griffith, 2d ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1984), pp. 35–77; and Giacomo Devoto *The Languages of Italy,* trans. V. Louise Katainen (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 191–231.

28. Quotations from Singleton trans. The rhyme and an unusual density of phonic repetition in the next canto might have some figural significance. The passage opens with a nesting of regular rhyme (*liete/siete*) framing an exact rhyme (*volte/volte*) which yields to an end-line rhyme (*Dio/rio/mio*) presaging internal rhymes (*io/Virgilio*). This elaborate play of sameness and difference figures Virgil's and Sordello's Mantuan and hence Italian identities in a way that calls attention to what they are and are not ("ella è non è," *Purg.* 7.12) as writers of Latin and Provençal with contested relationships to their Italian national identities.

29. *Opere,* pp. 310–11; Steven Botterill, trans., *De vulgari eloquentia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 23. See the critical commentary on Dante's vernacular backgrounds in Marianne Shapiro, *De vulgari eloquentia: Dante's Book of Exile* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), pp. 1–46 and 91–113. For Dante's text as an argument for language as the instrument of knowledge, history, and moral and legal decision making, see Giuseppe Mazzotta, *Dante's Vision and the Circle of Knowledge* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 17–24 and 48–50; for its nonfunctional, hypothetical relation to medieval theories of signification, see Marsha L. Collish, *The Mirror of Language,* 2d ed. (1968; rpt., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), pp. 175–83.

30. See *De vulgari eloquentia* 1.15, for Dante's censorious comment on Sordello's choice of Provençal over Italian: "This man of unusual eloquence abandoned the vernacular of his home town not only when writing poetry but on every other occasion" (Botterill, p. 35). For Sordello's political significance, see Theodolinda Barolini, *Dante's Poets: Textuality and Truth in the "Comedy"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 153–73.

31. The poem has also been attributed to Petrarch's friends Fazio degli Uberti and Antonio de' Beccari. See Natalino Sapegno, ed., *Poeti minori del Trecento* (Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1952), pp. 117–24, from which the text is quoted.

32. Sapegno, ed., *Poeti minori,* pp. 140–43. Addressed to Charles by a personified Italy, "la sposa tua, Italia bella" 'your spouse, beautiful Italy,' the poem places blame on Pope Innocent VI "che d'ogni mal s'incolpa" 'who is guilty of all evil' (45–47). In a later sonnet, "Se a legger Dante" 'If in reading Dante' (Sapegno, p. 145), Antonio applies Dante's judgment against Albert to Charles, now reproving him as "l'avaro ingrato e vile / imperador" 'the greedy, ungrateful, and vile emperor.' For Charles's political decision, see Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Origins of Modern Germany* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), pp. 314–19.

33. Sapegno, ed., *Poeti minori,* p. 201. For the political context, see Daniel Meredith Bueno de Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo Visconti (1351–1402): A Study in the Political Career of an Italian Despot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), pp. 45–68. For Milan's ascendance, see Marco Fossati and Alessandro Ceresatto, "Dai Visconti agli Sforza" in *Comuni e signorie nell'Italia settentrionale: La Lombardia,* ed. Giancarlo Adenna et al. (Turin: UTET, 1998), pp. 573–635. For the success of repressive *signorie* in subduing the feudal countryside in ways that eluded the republican communes, see Giorgio Chittolini, *La formazione dello stato regionale e le instituzioni del contado: secoli XIV–XV* (Turin: Einaudi, 1979).

34. Proemio, l. 27, Sapegno, ed., *Poeti minori.*

35. For the Latin etymology of *gens, gentis,* see the entry "gigno, gignere" in Alfred Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1985), pp. 270–73.

36. See Greenfeld, *Nationalism,* pp. 3–6; and Guido Zernatto, "Nation: The History of a Word," *Review of Politics* 6 (1944): 351–66. For the character of local medieval communities, see Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300,* 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 138–54.

37. Greenfeld, *Nationalism,* pp. 6–14.

38. Ca. 1565 Sir Thomas Smith, Elizabeth I's ambassador in France, uses the word *nation* interchangeably with *kingdom* and *commonwealth* when he describes differences in the social structures of France and England: "And when many cities, boroughes and villages were by their common and mutuall consent for their conservation ruled by that one and first father of them all, it was called a nation or kingdome," in *De Republica Anglorum* (published 1583), ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 59. The OED cites Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* "The Nation holds it no sinne to tarre them to Controversie" (2.2.370); compare, however, Montaigne's use in 1580 of the French word *nation,* already taken in this sense along with *païe* (country); in Florio's translation (1603): "There is nothing in that nation [*nation*] that is either barbarous or savage: . . . we have no other aim of truth and reason, than the example . . . of the country [*païe*] we live in," in *Selected Essays* (1.31), ed. Walter Kaiser (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), pp. 71–72. In *Tempest* 2.1.143 Shakespeare adapts this passage with the word

commonwealth: "I' th' commonwealth I would by contraries / Execute all things." For Montaigne's mediated encounter with the alterity of the New World and his reflections upon it as a meditation on the politics and social fabric of France, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 195–226.

39. Greenfeld, *Nationalism,* pp. 31–35.

40. *Geneva Bible,* ed. Berry; Greek text from *Polyglot Bibel.* For the impact of Scripture and religion upon early modern ideas of English nationhood, see Hastings, *Construction of Nationhood,* pp. 1–34 and 185–209.

41. For ancient, medieval, and early modern examples of ethnic consciousness as motives for national autarchy in a framework of polycentric myths and memories, see Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations,* pp. 21–91; as well as Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1983), pp. 153–91; and Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nationalism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 170–98.

42. See Lazzaro, "Italy as a Garden," pp. 37 ff.

43. See Kristen Lippencott, "The Art of Cartography in Fifteenth-Century Florence," in *Lorenzo the Magnificent: Culture and Politics,* ed. Michael Mallett and Nicholas Mann (London: Warburg Institute, 1996), pp. 131–51; and Lazzaro, "Italy as a Garden," pp. 38–39.

44. See Lazzaro, "Italy as a Garden," pp. 40 and 42–43; Rodney Shirley, *The Mapping of the World: Early Printed Maps, 1472–1700* (London: Holland, 1983); and Jerry Brotten, *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp. 151–79; for ancient concepts, see James S. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 215–22; for analogies among topographic maps, pictograms, and ethnographic consciousness in sixteenth-century French literature, see Conley, *Self-Made Map,* esp. pp. 202–47; for political implications, see David Buisseret, "Introduction" and "Monarchs, Ministers, and Maps," in *Monarchs, Ministers, and Maps: The Emergence of Cartography as a Tool of Government in Early Modern Europe,* ed. Buisseret (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 1–4 and 99–123.

45. For early formations of German identity, see Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany: The Reformation* (New York: Knopf, 1959), pp. 1–14.

46. See *Germani* (Germans), *germanitas* (brotherhood), and *germanus* (sibling) in Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *Latin Dictionary* (1879; rpt., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 811.

47. See *der Teutone* in *Duden: Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache,* 10 vols. (Mannheim: Duden, 1999), 9.3890. For the process of ethnogenesis defining such peoples in late antiquity, see Herwig Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples,* Thomas Dunlap, trans. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 102–22.

48. See *deutsch* in *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm,* 33 vols. (Munich: Deutsche Taschenbuch, 1984), 1.1043–48.

49. The Gothic adjective *tiudisk* entered late medieval Latin as *theodiscus,* whence its twelfth-century Italian form *tedesco;* see *tedesco* in Carlo Battisti and Giovanni Alessio, *Dizionario etimologico italiano,* 5 vols. (Florence: Barbera, 1957), 5.37–38.

50. For fluid, complex, and dynamic processes of imagining these peoples with cross-bred political rather than pure ethnic identities in late antiquity, see Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 63–150.

51. For the first century of the German monarchy, see Barraclough, *Origins,* pp. 24–45. For succeeding centuries up to the Thirty Years War, see Rudolf Vierhaus, *Germany in the Age of Absolutism,* trans. Jonathan B. Knudsen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), esp. pp. 31–57; and John Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime, 1600–1790* (New York: Longman, 1991), pp. 1–28. For the medieval kingdoms of Germany based on collective activity and ideas, see Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* pp. 289–98.

52. For the development of a national sentiment up to the eve of the Reformation, see Michael Hayes, *Early Modern Germany, 1477–1806* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), pp. 10–29. For the influence of the Reformation upon this self-definition which links moral behavior with civic strength through the institution of marriage, see Isabel Hull, *Sexuality, State, and Civil Society in Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 17–52.

53. A more authentic Castilian form might have been *españuelo* or *espanesco;* see Américo Castro, *The Spaniards: An Introduction to Their History,* trans. Willard F. King and Selma Margaretten (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), pp. 10–19.

54. For texts with an emphasis on fifteenth-century political unification, see Ciriaco Moron Arroyo, ed., *Antologìa de la Lirìca Medieval Castellana* (Salamanca: Publicacciones del Colegio de España, 1989), esp. pp. 131–37.

55. Castro, *Spaniards,* p. 16.

56. Castro, *Spaniards,* p. 11. The descent from Tubal appears in an earlier thirteenth-century Latin source, the *De rebus Hispaniae* of Jiménez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo. See Julio Valdeón Baruque, *Los conflictos sociales en el reino de Castilla en los siglos XIV y XV* (Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1975).

57. For the perception of Spanish purity and Spanish Catholicism in the eyes of other nations, see J. N. Hillgarth, *The Mirror of Spain, 1500–1700: The Formation of a Myth* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), pp. 71–124. For Spanish conceptions of the nation as a universal monarchy set against particularist French designs, see John Lynch, *Spain, 1516–1598: From Nation State to World Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), pp. 95–137.

58. Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (Salamanca, 1492), ed. Ignacio González-Llubera (New York: Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 3.

59. Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 226–44 and 266–75. Pre-modern ideas about Frankish origins depend upon the sixth-century account of the Franks by Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks,* trans. Lewis Thorpe (Har-

mondsworth: Penguin, 1974), pp. 118–27, based on now lost ancient histories by Frigeridus and Sulpicius Alexander; for a summary of modern scholarship, see Ian Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdom* (London: Longman, 1994).

60. Various versions are recounted in Robert Hanning, *The Vision of History in Early Britain* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

61. For French national identity as a product of a collective memory mindful of powerful polarities, see the essays of various authors in *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, under the direction of Pierre Nora, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996–98), and *Rethinking France*, under the direction of Pierre Nora, trans. Mary Trouille, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001). Subsequent endnotes will refer to specific essays in these volumes.

62. See Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* esp. pp. 28–49; and Greenfeld, *Nationalism,* pp. 42–54.

63. Lord Acton, "Nationality" (1862), in *Mapping the Nation,* ed. Gopal Balakrishnan (London: Verso, 1996), pp. 17–38: "A State which is incompetent to satisfy different races condemns itself; a State which labours to neutralize, to absorb, or to expel them, destroys its own vitality; a State which does not include them is destitute of the chief basis of self-government" (p. 36).

64. "Une nation est une âme, un principe spirituel. . . . Une nation est donc une grande solidarité constituée par le sentiment des sacrifices qu'on a faits et de ceux qu'on est disposé à faire encore," in Ernest Renan, "Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?" (1882), ed. Philippe Foret (Paris: Bordas, 1991), p. 41, with useful commentary from Maurice Barrès to Louis-Ferdinand Céline.

65. For the fusion of will, culture, and polity in the creation of nationhood, see Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism,* pp. 53–58.

66. For comparisons between Renan and Lord Acton, see Anthony D. Smith, "Nationalism and the Historians," in Balakrishnan, *Mapping the Nation,* pp. 175–97. For the contradictions of English nationalism, see Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* pp. 84–89. For a defense of the French idea, see Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism,* trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 25–48. On the limits of assimilation, see Emmanuel Levinas, *In the Time of the Nations,* trans. Michael B. Smith (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), pp. 49–55. For comparisons between a French political assimilationist understanding of citizenship and nationhood and a German ethnocultural understanding, see Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 21–34.

67. See Fernand Braudel, *The Identity of France,* trans. Sian Reynolds (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), pp. 85–103; François Furet and Jacques Ozouf, *Reading and Writing: Literacy in France from Calvin to Jules Ferry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 100–148; and Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976), pp. 67–94.

68. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), pp. 220–28; and Etienne Balibar, "The Nation Form: History and Ideology," and Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Construction of Peoplehood," in Balibar and Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso, 1991), pp. 86–106 and 71–85, respectively.

69. On the formation of national languages through either assimilation or respect of difference, see Françoise Gadet and Michel Pecheux, *La langue introuvable* (Paris: François Maspero, 1981), pp. 32–46.

70. See Balibar, "Nation Form," pp. 86–106; and Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste,* trans. Richard Nice (London: Routledge, 1984), pp. 22–24. For the relationship between language and society in the early modern period, see Peter Burke, "Introduction," in *The Social History of Language,* ed. Peter Burke and Roy Porter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 1–20.

71. For belief in aristocratic inheritance as a form of genetic determination, see Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), pp. 85–103.

72. All quotations from the First Part of *Urania* refer to Roberts, ed., here quoted from pp. 22 and 61.

73. For the importance of vertical descent in earlier medieval ethnology, see R. Howard Bloch, *Etymologies and Genealogies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 64–91.

74. See Emile Benveniste, *Indo-European Language and Society,* trans. Elizabeth Palmer (London: Faber and Faber, 1973), pp. 218–23, for linguistic evidence that speakers of a common "mother tongue" do so without legal status in classificatory systems based on maternal identity.

75. For this distinction, see Ghassan Hage, "The Spacial Imaginary of National Practices," *Environment and Planning, Series D: Society and Space* 14 (1996): 463–85, esp. pp. 470–77. For the importance of historically accurate distinctions between "patriotism" and "nationalism," see Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 160–87; for the transformation of these terms from reflecting a fact of nature to asserting an act of political will in the eighteenth century, see David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 40–43 and 71–77.

76. See Walter J. Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), pp. 113–41.

77. For a careful distinction between national sentiment traceable to communal feeling and national consciousness arising from a sense of wounded pride, see Isaiah Berlin, "Nationalism: Past Neglect and Present Power," in *Against the Current* (New York: Viking Press, 1980), pp. 333–55, esp. pp. 341–49. For poetic language as a transitional medium, see Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism,* pp. 39–45.

78. For the formation of the early modern state as a locus of sovereignty aimed at restoring order over creative forces of self-determination stimulated by Renaissance humanism, see Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), pp. 70–78.

79. For the state's need to regulate such claims in order to contain power and control violence, see Anthony Giddens, *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism,* vol. 1: *Power, Property, and the State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), pp. 144–47 and 183–94; and vol. 2: *The Nation-State and Violence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 116–21.

80. For the double-edged residue of national identification, see Hardt and Negri, *Empire,* pp. 93–113. For ideological belief not as an interior sentiment but as an exterior embodiment of the practices of a people, see Slavoj Zizek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1990), pp. 28–43.

81. Sabbatino, *L'Idioma volgare,* pp. 148–62. Michele Barbi argues that Trissino had found the text by 1523; see Barbi, *Della fortuna di Dante nel secolo XVI* (Pisa: Nistri, 1890), pp. 95–100.

82. For the concept of proto-elite and its cultivation of linguistic capital, see Ronald Wardhaugh, *Languages in Competition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), pp. 51–63.

83. For applications of game theory to hegemonic social and political purposes, see David D. Laitin, *Language Repertories and State Construction in Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 24–46; and Stanley Lieberson, *Language Diversity and Language Contact* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1981), pp. 349–77.

One Petrarch as Commentator

1. For Petrarch's decision to shape his *Epystolarum mearum ad diversos liber* into his *Rerum familiarum libri,* see Giuseppe Billanovich, *Petrarca letterato I: Lo scrittoio del Petrarca* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1947), pp. 1–56; for the epistolary form as an ideal medium of inquiry into Petrarch's deepest questions of moral and aesthetic choice, see Nancy S. Struever, *Theory as Practice: Ethical Inquiry in the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 7–56. For Petrarch's break with formulaic strictures of earlier public letter writing, see Ronald G. Witt, *"In the Footsteps of the Ancients": The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 260–75; for his emphasis on the ethics of the self in the *Familiares,* see Giuseppe Mazzotta, *The Worlds of Petrarch* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), pp. 80–101; for a survey of epistolary forms and uses, see Najemy, *Between Friends,* pp. 18–57, with close analysis of *Fam.* 1.1 on pp. 25–30.

2. See the masterful studies by Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 81–146; and *The Vulnerable Text* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 18–45. For Petrarch's ambivalence in

accommodating classical notions of temporal circularity to Christian notions of temporal linearity, see Aldo S. Bernardo, "Petrarch's Autobiography: Circularity Revisited," *Annali d'Italianistica* 4 (1986): 45–72.

3. For the historical context, see John Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch* (New York: Longman, 1980), pp. 25–67; and Ruggiero Romano, *Tra due crisi: L'Italia del Rinascimento* (Turin: Einaudi, 1971), pp. 8–34. For speculation about the impact of the Black Death on demographic behavior and the development of new forms of cultural and intellectual life in the vernacular, see David Herlihy, *The Black Death and the Transformation of the West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), pp. 59–81.

4. The first page number in parentheses refers to Aldo Bernardo's magisterial translation, which I quote throughout; the second refers to the Latin text edited by Rossi. For Petrarch's humanist sense of textual recovery, see Carol Everhart Quillen, *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), pp. 106–47; for Petrarch's travel writing as an antidote for alienation, see Theodore Cachey, *Petrarch's Guide to the Holy Land* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp. 29–31.

5. See Cicero, *Selected Letters,* trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), pp. 9–23 and 37–59. For Cicero's public reputation, see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Select Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 1–17; for shifting structures in his letters to Atticus, see G. O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 169–71.

6. For Petrarch's changing attitude toward Cicero, see Giuseppe Billanovich, "Petrarca e Cicerone" in *Petrarca e il primo umanesimo* (Padua: Antenore, 1996), pp. 97–116.

7. For Petrarch's sense of himself as a wandering exile, see Mazzotta, *Worlds of Petrarch,* pp. 181–92; and Randolph Starn, *Contrary Commonwealth: The Theme of Exile in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), pp. 132–40.

8. See, for example, "richer but more hampered [*ditior*/*impe-ditior*)" (3/241); "conflict and contradiction [*di-versa*/*ad-versa*]" (7/245); and "so much about so little [*tam multa de tam parva*]" (11/248). For Petrarch's simultaneous denial and confirmation of his literary language in *Fam.* 1.1, see Najemy, *Between Friends,* pp. 25–30.

9. In *Inferno* 26.112–20 Ulysses' rhetorical appeal, "O frati . . . ", instantiates his skills in verbal manipulation and therefore the very reason for which he is condemned for evil counsel. This allusion to corrosive rhetoric darkens Petrarch's concern with his own effect on readers.

10. For Petrarch's letters as exemplifying his membership in different communities of readership with different rules for different audiences, see Quillen, *Rereading the Renaissance,* pp. 148–81; Struever, *Theory as Practice,* pp. 20–22; and Erich Auerbach, *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the*

Middle Ages, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 275–338. For St. Augustine's influence in defining the reader's role, see Kathy Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 53–63; Brian Stock, "Reading, Writing, and the Self: Petrarch and His Forerunners," *New Literary History* 26 (1995): 717–30; and *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), pp. 162–206.

11. For Petrarch's sense of the writer as a civilizer and of rhetoric as a tool in civic matters in *Fam.* 1.9, see Wayne Rebhorn, *The Emperor of Men's Minds* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 23–50.

12. For an overview of the growth of the Visconti state, see Bueno de Mesquita, *Galeazzo Visconti,* pp. 1–68; and Eric Russell Chamberlin, *The Count of Virtue: Giangaleazzo Visconti, Duke of Milan* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1965), pp. 11–30. For an ingenious but now disapproved view of the administrative apparatus of Viscontian governance as a model for the early modern state, see Federico Chabod, "Was There a Renaissance State?" in *The Development of the Modern State,* ed. Heinz Lubasz (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 26–42. For Francesco Carrara, see Benjamin G. Kohl, *Padua under the Carrara, 1318–1405* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 103–204.

13. For Petrarch's relations with the Visconti lords, see Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *Petrarch's Eight Years in Milan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1958), pp. 138–42. For Milan in Petrarch's time, see Marco Fossati and Alessandro Ceresatto, "La Lombardia alla ricerca d'uno stato," in *Comuni e signorie nell'Italia settentrionale: La Lombardia,* ed. Giancarlo Andenna et al. (Turin: UTET, 1998), pp. 483–571; and Patrizia Mainoni, "Un bilancio di Giovanni Visconti, arcivescovo e signore di Milano," in *L'età dei Visconti,* ed. Luisa Chiappi Mauri et al. (Milan: La Storia, 1993), pp. 3–26. For the conflict between Viscontian despotism and Florentine republicanism as shaping Petrarch's reception by Chaucer, see David Wallace, *Chaucerian Polity: Absolutist Images and Associational Forms in England and Italy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 38–62.

14. Even more explicitly in *Seniles* 8.3 dated 1367 and written at Pavia after leaving the Visconti's service, Petrarch praises the patience in adversity of "that greatest man of our sphere, the mighty ruler of Liguria, Galeazzo Visconti the younger" (Bernardo 1.283). For Milan in Filelfo's time, see Fossati and Ceresatto, "Dai Visconti agli Sforza," in *Comuni e signorie,* ed. Andenna et al., pp. 573–635. For the shaping of Petrarch's reputation by academies of humanist initiates, see Wallace, *Chaucerian Polity,* pp. 261–85.

15. For Petrarch's contradictory evaluations of Dante, see Aldo S. Bernardo, "Petrarch's Attitude toward Dante," *PMLA* 70 (1955): 488–517; Paolo Trovato, *Dante in Petrarca: Per un inventario dei dantismi nel "Rerum vulgarium fragmenta"* (Florence: Olschki, 1979); Giorgio Orelli, *Il suono dei sospiri: Sul Petrarca volgare* (Turin: Einaudi, 1990), pp. 124–62; Domenico De Robertis, *Memoriale petrarchesco* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1997), pp. 45–64; and Guido Capovilla, *"Si vario stile": Studi*

sul Canzoniere del Petrarca (Modena: Mucchi, 1998), pp. 103–201. For Petrarch's language in the context of fourteenth-century developments, see Migliorini, *Italian Language,* pp. 134–54. For the fragmentation of Latin in early medieval Italy, see Pei, *Italian Language,* pp. 138–60; and Devoto, *Languages of Italy,* pp. 122–47; for the transition from Latin to Italian in Dante's time, see Pulgram, *Tongues of Italy,* pp. 402–20.

16. For Dante's contribution toward developing the popular literary public to which Petrarch disparagingly refers, see Erich Auerbach, *Literary Language and Its Public,* pp. 220–33, 296–317. The figure of Dametas refers to the pastoral poetaster in Virgil's *Eclogue* 3.

17. Writing again to Boccaccio in 1366–67, however, he commends Dante absolutely as "the master of our vernacular literature" (*Seniles* 5.2; Bernardo trans., 1.160) and as a plausible contender for first place in Florence's literary pantheon. Here Petrarch suggests that he and Dante excel over Boccaccio in popular esteem: "Do you bear it so ill to be thus outdone by one or two men, especially fellow citizens?" (1.160). For Petrarch's relationship with Boccaccio, see Bilanovich, *Petrarca letterato,* pp. 57–294; and Vittore Branca, "Petrarch and Boccaccio," in *Francisco Petrarch: Citizen of the World,* ed. Aldo S. Bernardo (Padua: Antenore, 1980), pp. 193–222.

18. For Petrarch's efforts to equal the past, see Giuseppe Velli, *Petrarca e Boccaccio: Tradizione, memoria, scritture* (Padua: Antenore, 1979), pp. 46–60. For Petrarch's elevation of Latin over the vernacular, a choice followed by later humanists, see Riccardo Fubini, *Umanesimo e secolarizzazione da Petrarca a Valla* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1990), pp. 1–54.

19. The charge has haunted readers and critics ever since. For inextricably bound elements of fiction and reality in Laura's identity, see Enrico Carrara, *Studi petrarcheschi e altri scritti* (Turin: Il Bottega d'Erasmo, 1959), pp. 79–111; F. J. Jones, "Further Evidence of the Identity of Petrarch's Laura," *Italian Studies* 39 (1984): 27–46; Roger Kuin, *Chamber Music: Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Pleasures of Criticism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 141–49; and Gordon Braden, *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 15–22. For the emblematic representation of Laura and the physical landscape of Italy and Vaucluse, see Sara Sturm-Maddox, *Petrarch's Laurels* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), pp. 63–100.

20. The phrase "the stage setting of my mind laid bare" is the translation given by Morris Bishop, *Petrarch and His World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), p. 32. For Petrarch's declared inability to escape the condition of intermediate space and time, see Albert Russell Ascoli, "Petrarch's Middle Age: Memory, Imagination, History, and 'The Ascent of Mount Ventoux,'" *Stanford Italian Review* 10 (1991): 5–44.

21. For Laura as a figure of creativity, see Aldo S. Bernardo, *Petrarch, Laura, and the "Triumphs"* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1974), pp. 26–60;

for Laura as a figure of philosophy (Laureta = La Verità), see Wilhelm Pötters, *Chi era Laura? Strutture linguistiche e matematiche del "Canzoniere"* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1987), pp. 115–32. For the abyss separating Petrarch from Laura, motivating his awareness of limits and his desire to overtake them in the manner of Orpheus, who reclaims Eurydice in the labyrinth of his poetry, see Ingrid Rossellini, *Nel trapassar del segno: Idoli della mente ed echi della vita nei "Rerum vulgarium fragmenta"* (Florence: Olschki, 1995), pp. 61–101 and 143–77.

22. The palindromic *amor/Roma* may point to the name's occult ritual significance, a secret inversion mentioned in Servius' gloss on *Aeneid* 1.277; Virgil perhaps puns on this inversion in *Aeneid* 4.347 when Aeneas exchanges love of Dido for love of Rome, "hic amor hic patria est"; see Susan Skulsky, "Invitus, regina: Aeneas and the Love of Rome," *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985): 447–55. For palindromic etymology in Virgil, see James J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), pp. 122–23, 156. For visual palindromes of *amor/Roma* in Pompeian graffiti, see Keith Stanley, "Rome, Eros, and the Versus Romae," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 4 (1963): 237–49. For Varronian wordplay throughout classical Latin poetry, see Frederick Ahl, *Metaformations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

23. For Petrarch's fascination with palindromes, anagrams, and the profound accord between sound and sense in his vernacular poetry, see Orelli, *Il suono dei sospiri,* esp. pp. 3–22. For the dominance of moral and political myth over historical fact in shaping Petrarch's attitude toward Rome, see Peter Bondanella, *The Eternal City: Roman Images in the Modern World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), pp. 23–37. For Dante's universalist view of Rome as the jurisdictional center of the world, see Charles Till Davis, *Dante and the Idea of Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 100–138.

24. Translation by Wilkins, "Coronation Oration," p. 1241. For Latin text, see Carlo Godi, "La 'collatio laureationis' del Petrarca," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 13 (1970): 1–27. For Petrarch's relationship with King Robert of Naples, who certified him for coronation, see Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch,* pp. 46–58. For the importance of the site, see Joseph B. Trapp, "The Poet Laureate: Rome, *Renovatio,* and *Translatio Imperii,*" in *Rome in the Renaissance,* ed. Paul Ramsey (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982), pp. 93–131; for Petrarch's dream of a pan-Italian state with Rome at its nucleus, see Philip Jacks, *The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origin of Rome in Renaissance Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 35–51.

25. For a reading of the Oration in theological terms that link the poet's capacity for love with that of an Apollonine Christ, see Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, *Petrarch's Genius: Pentimento and Prophecy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 11–43. For the significance of the Coronation Oration in Petrarch's poetic career, see Ernest Hatch Wilkins, "The Coronation of Petrarch," in *The Making of the Canzoniere* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1951), pp. 9–69.

26. For Petrarch's idea of this task in the context of defining his profession as a humanist, see Douglas Biow, *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries: Humanism and the Professions in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp. 27–44.

27. For motifs of civic responsibility and patriotism based on similitudes between labor and love in the *Georgics,* see Gary B. Miles, *Virgil's "Georgics": A New Interpretation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 1–63; and Christine G. Perkell, *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Virgil's "Georgics"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 100–115.

28. For salutary reminders that distinctions between late scholasticism and early humanism have been exaggerated, see Erica Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 29–35; and Charles Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought,* 2 vols. (London: Constable, 1970), 1.173–99.

29. The Virgilian "vincet amor patriae" and the narrative of Brutus' condemnation will figure in relation to Joachim Du Bellay's *Deffence et illustration* and Philip Sidney's *Arcadia,* with implications for French and English national sentiment (see pages 222–27).

30. For Petrarch's relationship with Cola di Rienzo, see Fabio Vander, *La modernità italiana: Critica della crisi e percezione del tempo in Dante e Petrarca* (Lecce: Manni, 1997), pp. 128–57; for translated texts, see Mario E. Cosenza, *Francesco Petrarca and the Revolution of Cola di Rienzo,* ed. Roland C. Musto, 2d ed. (New York: Italica, 1986), esp. pp. 75–98 on the reform of Rome, pp. 151–78 on Cola's fall, and pp. 209–52 on Cola's defense; for implications in Petrarch's political thinking, see Mazzotta, *Worlds of Petrarch,* pp. 111–23.

31. For the conjunction of poetry and history in Petrarch's figuration of the laurel, see Stefano Gensini, "Poeta et historicus: L'episodio della laurea nella carriera e nella prospetiva culturale di Francesco Petrarca," *La Cultura* 18 (1980): 166–94.

32. Quotations refer to Ovid, *Heroides and Amores*, Grant Showerman, ed. and trans., Loeb Classical Library edition.

33. For an earlier caution about scattered rhymes as a derogation of responsibility, see Dante's disclaimer in describing the procession of the griffon, "A descriver lor forme più non spargo / rime, lettor" 'Reader, I am not scattering more rhymes to describe their forms' (*Purgatorio* 29.97–98). For the identification of the Roman elegiac poets with the female role to the exclusion of conventional male pursuits in politics, law, and the military, see Ellen Greene, *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 67–92.

34. For the contrast between epic aspirations and lyric tendencies in *Africa,* see Vinicio Pacca, *Petrarca* (Bari: Laterza, 1998), pp. 45–55. For Ovidian elegy as a genre of compromise in the context of Petrarch's writing, see Christopher Martin, *Policy in Love: Lyric and Public in Ovid, Petrarch, and Shakespeare* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1994), pp. 17–33 and 75–96.

35. For Petrarch's panegyric on epideictic rhetoric and its civic functions, see Stephen Murphy, *The Gift of Immortality: Myths of Power and Humanist Poetics* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1997), pp. 90–126. For the impact of Livy upon Petrarch's thinking about the Republic, see Giuseppe Billanovich, "Petrarch's Textual Tradition of Livy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 14 (1951): 137–208. For Petrarch's displacement of his humanist aspirations into the classical matter and style of *Africa,* see Greene, *Vulnerable Text,* pp. 18–45.

36. For Petrarch's efforts to anchor his epic in history, see Aldo S. Bernardo, *Petrarch, Scipio, and the "Africa"* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962), pp. 127–67; and Nicholas Festa, *Saggio sull' "Africa" del Petrarca* (Palermo: Sandron, 1926), pp. 2–21. For the central position of the study of history in Petrarch's work, see Raffaele Amaturo. *Petrarca,* 3d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1988), pp. 92–111; Marco Ariani, *Petrarca* (Rome: Salerno, 1999), pp. 87–97; and Witt, *"In the Footsteps of the Ancients,"* pp. 276–91. For the poem's relevance to a contemporaneous readership, see Vincenzo Fera, *Antichi editori e lettori dell' "Africa"* (Messina: Centro di Studii Umanistici, 1984).

37. The first line number in parentheses refers to the Latin text edited by Nicola Festa; the second refers to the translation by Thomas Bergin and Alice Wilson.

38. For the poetics implied in these lines as one constituted by a relationship with temporal power, see Stephen Murphy, *Gift of Immortality,* pp. 102–26; for the cult of Scipio and the active life of civic well-being, see Bernardo, *Petrarch, Scipio, and the "Africa",* pp. 151–58.

39. For Petrarch's affirmation of Plato's moral philosophy as mediated by the Church Fathers, see Witt, *"In the Footsteps of the Ancients,"* pp. 239–60. For Petrarch's probable reading of a Latin translation of Plato's *Timaeus* and its possible influence on his separation of rhetoric, subjectivity, and the theology of faith from metaphysical substance, see Charles Trinkaus, *The Poet as Philosopher* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), pp. 27–51.

40. Text and translation by Thomas Bergin in *Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio: Studies in the Italian Trecento in Honor of Charles S. Singleton,* ed. Aldo S. Bernardo and Anthony Pellegrini (Binghamton: Medieval and Early Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1983), pp. 183–229.

41. Notably eclogue 2 on the death of King Robert, eclogue 5 on Cola di Rienzo, eclogues 6 and 7 on the Avignon papacy, eclogue 9 on the Black Death, and eclogue 12 on the Hundred Years War. For massive changes in the European social system precipitated by the effects of these years, see George Huppert, *After the Black Death: A Social History of Early Modern Europe,* 2d ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), esp. pp. 30–55. For the Avignon papacy's pinnacle of power and prestige at midcentury, see Yves Renouard, *The Avignon Papacy, 1305–1403,* trans. Denis Bethell (Hamden: Archon, 1970), pp. 37–58. For Petrarch's eclogues as part of an integral autobiographical project embracing the *Familiares* and the *Rime sparse,* intimated in *Secretum,* which he drafted during these years,

see Marco Santagata, *I frammenti dell'anima: Storia e racconto nel canzoniere del Petrarca* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1992), pp. 73–101 and, for specifically autobiographical portions of the *Rime sparse,* pp. 170–90.

42. See Catherine Edwards, *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 134–35; for Cola di Rienzo in this context, see Bondanella, *Eternal City,* pp. 31–37.

Two Petrarchan Totems and Political Taboos

1. See Wilkins, *Life,* pp. 122–28, for Petrarch's repatriation in late May or June of that year as a major divide in his adult life.

2. For Petrarch's figuration of Vaucluse as an Augustinian Arcadia and its subsequent designation as a pastoral locale in later French literature, see Eve Duperray, *L'or des mots: Une lecture de Pétrarque et du mythe littéraire de Vaucluse* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997), pp. 21–44 and 287–326.

3. See Fossati and Ceresatto, "La Lombardia," pp. 483–521. For the Visconti, see the works by Bueno de Mesquita, *Galeazzo Visconti;* Chamberlin, *Count of Virtue;* and Mainoni, "Un bilancio di Giovanni Visconti."

4. See Herlihy, *Black Death and the Transformation of the West,* pp. 59–81.

5. For Petrarch's sense of his indenture to the patronage system implied in the *Secretum* and other writings dating from 1347, with a good summary of his relationships with Cola di Rienzo, see Dolora Wojciehowski, *Old Masters, New Subjects: Early Modern and Post-Structuralist Theories of the Will* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), pp. 52–78.

6. This passage tellingly shifts its vocative from the letter's addressee, Giovanni Aretino, to the plural "friends": "This is my response to you, my dear friends, as many as you may be" (3.34/954), in evident reference to the outcry about his monstrous inconsistency. For Petrarch's adaptation of Augustinian theories of the will to his own poetic voice, see Lisa Frienkel, *Reading Shakespeare's Will: The Theology of Figure from Augustine to the Sonnets* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 47–114. For his Augustinian response to the parable of the prodigal son, see Jill Robbins, *Prodigal Son/Elder Brother: Interpretation and Alterity in Augustine, Petrarch, Kafka, and Levinas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 49–70.

7. For an analysis of this letter, see Kennedy, "Versions of a Career: Petrarch and His Renaissance Commentators," in *European Literary Careers,* ed. Patrick Cheney and Robert De Armas (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), pp. 146–64.

8. For Petrarch's interest in such political matters as a special type of pursuing the glory proclaimed in the *Secretum* and *Rime sparse,* see Aldo Bernardo, "The Importance of the Non-Love Poems of Petrarch's *Canzoniere,*" *Italica* 27 (1950): 302–12. For Petrarch's diplomatic role in Viscontian Milan, see Carlo Muscetta, "Crisi e sviluppi della cultura dal comune alle signore," in Amaturo, *Petrarca,* pp. 3–40.

9. For Visconti patronage in the context of Milanese dominion and its political history as a system of courtly feudatories linked to the ducal estate, see Gregory Lubkin, *A Renaissance Court: Milan under Galeazzo Maria Sforza* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 4–19. For literary documents relating to the long struggle between Florence and Milan illustrating the power of traditional scholastic polemics under Franco Sacchetti and Giovanni Gherardi against servile Milanese humanism and the rise of Florentine civic humanism under Salutati, see *Firenze contro Milano: Gli intellettuali fiorentini melle guerre con i Visconti, 1390–1440,* ed. Antonio Lanza (Rome: De Rubeis, 1991), esp. pp. 119–35. For the conflict between Florentine Republican liberty and the dynastic despotism of Lombardy, see Wallace, *Chaucerian Polity,* esp. pp. 38–62 on the Visconti and pp. 337–78 on Petrarch's construction of a singular and eccentric personality. For effects on the culture of the Visconti, see Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch,* pp. 128–52.

10. For the poem as a parody of sexual encounters in pilgrim narratives, see Marco Santagata, *Amante e amanti: Figure della lirica amorosa fra Dante e Petrarca* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1999), pp. 181–87.

11. For Pandolfo Malatesta, see Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch,* pp. 215–18. For Petrarch's complex relationship with Pandolfo and the courtly patronage that he sought from this lord to whom he presented a copy of his *Rime sparse* on 4 January 1373, see *Seniles* 13.11; and Santagata, *I frammenti,* pp. 281–95. See also Petrarch's poem dedicated to Pandolfo, sonnet 104, with useful notes in Santagata ed., pp. 483–85.

12. For Filelfo's hostility to Florence, see Diana Robin, *Filelfo in Milan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 12–15 and 77; and Deborah Parker, *Commentary and Ideology,* pp. 53–57. For Visconti succession from Petrarch to Filelfo, see the *Enciclopedia di Milano,* ed. Guido Aghina (Milan: F. M. Ricci, 1998), pp. 717–24.

13. For Petrarch's strained relationship with the Colonna family, see Ariani, *Petrarca,* pp. 249–57.

14. Castelvetro, for example, names "la terra vostra" as Rome and decides that the unnamed addressee is a prominent Roman citizen and potential patron: "L'aspetto della terra di Roma lo'nduceua a deuotione" 'The sight of Rome moves him to devotion' (135).

15. See Vittore Branca, *Boccaccio medioevale* (Florence: Sansoni, 1975), pp. 300–332.

16. Despite Petrarch's gravitation to northern Italy, Rome, and Naples, the linguistic features of the *Rime sparse* are predominantly Tuscan with an overlay of Sicilian and Bolognese literary variations inherited from Giacomo da Lentini and Guido Guinizelli. See the catalog in Maurizio Vitale, *La lingua del Canzoniere (Rerum vulgarium fragmenta) di Francesco Petrarca* (Padova: Antenore, 1996), with analysis on pp. 533–41.

17. For the high degree of wordplay and anagrammatic structure that associates Italy's saviors with Christ in these poems, see Orelli, *Il suono dei sospiri,* pp. 36–45.

18. Only Filelfo and Daniello identify the recently deceased Cino as addressee; others speculate upon Sennuccio del Bene, Petrarch's brother Gherardo, Sagramoro di Pommiers, and even Boccaccio. For a modern reading of these poems as representing Petrarch's wish to escape the bondage of love in public, see Sturm-Maddox, *Petrarch's Laurels,* pp. 141–66.

19. For Filelfo's shift of allegiance from the Visconti to the Sforza regimes as registered in his epic *Sforziad,* see Karen Lippencott, "The Neo-Latin Historical Epics of the North Italian Courts: An Examination of Courtly Culture in the Fifteenth Century," *Renaissance Studies* 3 (1989): 415–28.

20. Vellutello's determination perversely counter's Petrarch's own obsessive rearranging of his *canzoniere;* for meanings conveyed by his graphetic engineering of the text, see H. Wayne Storey, *Transcription and Visual Poetics in the Early Italian Lyric* (New York: Garland, 1993), pp. 341–419. For Petrarch's self-conscious arrangement as subverting both typological function and the passage of time or change and conversion, see Olivia Holmes, *Assembling the Lyric Self: Authorship from the Troubadour Song to the Italian Poetry Book* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), pp. 170–80.

21. For details, see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 285–88.

22. See *Seniles* 13.9–11, "My vernacular trifles came to you as a gesture of friendship. . . . I wish they were worthy of your hands, your eyes, and your judgment" (*Seniles* 13.11; Bernardo trans. p. 499). For Petrarch's address to Pandolfo Malatesta in his attempt to reach a double audience, both courtly and noncourtly, see Santagata, *I frammenti,* pp. 109–24, 158–70, and 281–95. For patterns of patronage, see John Larner, *Culture and Society in Italy 1290–1420* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), pp. 121–68.

23. For Petrarch's attitudes toward various contemporary and earlier vernacular poets, see Santagata, *I frammenti,* pp. 271–81; and Antonio Lanza, *Studi sulla lirica del trecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1978).

24. Modern scholarship identifies the recipient as Tommaso Caloiro (Carducci ed., pp. 9–10) or, more convincingly, Giovanni Colonna (Santagata ed., pp. 35–40).

25. For a recent summation of Petrarch's relationship to his contemporaries, to classical poets whom he and they echoed, and to Provençal conventions that they mutually inherited, see Rosanna Bettarini, *Lacrime e inchiostro nel canzoni di Petrarca* (Bologna: Cooperativo Libreria Universitaria Editrice, 1998), pp. 9–44 and 177–86.

26. For Petrarch's criticism of the papacy, see Boyle, *Petrarch's Genius,* pp. 74–112; for his discursive writing on the Avignon papacy, see Robert Coogan, *Babylon on the Rhone: A Translation of Letters by Dante, Petrarch, and Catherine of Siena on the Avignon Papacy* (Madrid: J. P. Turanzas, 1983). For the papacy of Clement VI and the building of the papal palace at Avignon, see Renouard, *Avignon Papacy,* pp. 42–49.

27. See also Vellutello's reading of one sonnet and two canzoni that project visions of a redeemed Europe and a unified Italy. In his view sonnet 27, "Il successor di Carlo" 'The successor of Charles,' and canzone 28, "O aspettata in Ciel beata et bella / anima" 'O soul awaited in heaven, blessed and beautiful,' address the French king Philip VI (1328–56), the first Valois monarch whose dynasty still ruled in Vellutello's era. Both poems support the idea that Petrarch looked to France as a bulwark of Christendom, as a protection against the Teutonic Roman Empire, and as a corrector of vices in the papacy. Their speaker exhorts Philip to rally Europe to a crusade against the Turks, commending Philip's epithet, "Rex Christianissimus," as a title vouchsafed to French kings since the eighth century which proclaims the power of France, its formative national identity, and a political force to reckon with. Pope Stephen II conferred this title upon Pepin in 754, and Pope Innocent IV revived it in the thirteenth century to acknowledge Louis IX's help in the Crusades. In 1296 Philip the Fair seized upon it in his conflict with the papacy to undermine the authority of Boniface VIII; see Colette Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 172–87. In canzone 53, addressed to a savior of Rome, "Spirto gentil che quelle membra reggi" 'Noble spirit, you who govern those members,' Vellutello identifies the recipient as Cola di Rienzo. (Modern scholarship identifies the recipient as Bosone da Gubbio, designated a Roman senator just after Petrarch's arrival there in 1337; see Carducci, ed., pp. 76–77 and 80–84; and Santagata ed., pp. 273–85.) Petrarch's anger at Italy, now "vecchia oziosa et lenta" 'old, idle, and slow,' and his lament for "tutto quel ch' una ruina involve" 'everything which this one ruin carries off' constitute a plea for Rome to be "liberata e conseruata dal Tiranno" 'freed and preserved from the tyrant' (189^{r}), referring to its corporate body of nobles, including the poet's Colonna patrons.

28. See Wilkins, *Life,* pp. 44–51; for the pioneering use of mercenaries in fourteenth-century Italy, see Michael Mallett, *Mercenaries and Their Masters* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowan and Littlefield, 1974), pp. 28–50; and Larner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch,* pp. 215–26.

29. Four years earlier Petrarch's benefactor Azzo da Correggio had overthrown Martino della Scala as lord of Parma, and in 1344 he sold the city to Obizzo d'Este, the marquis of Ferrara. Filippino da Gonzaga, the lord of Mantua, then incited Luchino Visconti of Milan against Obizzo. By February 1345 each had recruited his own mercenary army. See Theodore Mommsen, "The Date of Petrarch's Canzone 'Italia mia,'" *Speculum* 14 (1939): 28–37; and noted in Santagata ed., pp. 613–24.

30. See Maria Nadia Covini, "Per la storia delle milizie viscontee: I famigliari armigeri di Filippo Maria Visconti," in *L'età dei Visconti,* ed. Luisa Chiappi Mauri et al. (Milan: La Storia, 1993), pp. 35–64.

31. For the impact of the French and Spanish invasions on cultural life and readings such as Vellutello's, see Eric W. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 161–211.

32. For Charles's goals, see Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France, c. 1500–c. 1800* (New Haven: Yale Univer-

sity Press, 1995), pp. 41–44; for the cultural climate of Italy after 1527 in which advocates of doctrinal orthodoxy bolstered church authority in the wake of humanist revisions of church history, see Kenneth Gouwens, *Remembering the Renaissance: Humanist Narratives of the Sack of Rome* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998), pp. 168–74.

33. Gesualdo dismisses Vellutello's claim that Petrarch initially admired Lewis, for nowhere in his writing does the poet mention him: "Ne taciuto haurebbe egli del Bauaro, s'a tanta speranza per lui si fosse inalzato" 'Nor would he have been silent about the Bavarian if he had mounted such hopes for him' (CLXXVII^{v}). The war between Genoa and Venice, however, set the most important leaders of Italy against one another in taboo strife, and it furnished a plausible motivation for Petrarch's poem. Begun in 1351, the conflict disturbed a region already decimated by the Black Death, and it troubled a poet grieving his loss of Laura. Gesualdo speculates that Petrarch could have written the poem after accepting the Viscontis' invitation in 1353 in order to exhort his new patrons to defend Italy: "Il che fu nel M.cccliiii. nel qual tempo creder si potrebbe, ch'egli facesse questa Canz." 'That was in 1354, at which time it could be believed that he composed this canzone' (CLXXVIII^{r}).

34. Compare the recent feminist assessment of wounds inflicted by male desires on the feminized body of Italy by Margaret Brose, "Petrarch's Beloved Body: 'Italia mia,'" in *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature,* ed. Linda Lomperis and Sarah Stanbury (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 1–20.

35. For Lutheran reform in Modena, where Fausto wrote, and for the impact of the Sack of Rome on reformational thinking in Italy, see Massimo Firpo, *Riforma protestante ed eresie nell'Italia del cinquecento* (Bari: Laterza, 1993), pp. 53–70 and 101–14. For analogies between Petrarch's concept of a rhetorical moral counsel with exhortations to faith and a theology of salvation by grace with predestinarian overtones, see Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness,* 1.5–49.

36. For the lexical "unitonality" that permits such blurring in the *Rime sparse,* see Vitale, *La lingua del Canzoniere,* pp. 17–28.

Three Amor *and* Patria

1. For discussion, see Thomas G. Bergin, *Boccaccio* (New York: Viking, 1981), pp. 204–13; Janet Smarr, *Boccaccio and Fiammetta: The Lover as Narrator* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), pp. 205–22; and Braden, *Petrarchan Love,* pp. 63–74. For a finely nuanced study of gender relationships in the Decameron, see Marilyn Migiel, *A Rhetoric of the "Decameron"* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

2. Boccaccio had meanwhile begun a collection of Latin eclogues in a quasi-Virgilian erotic mode, but, upon encountering Petrarch's early *Bucolicum carmen,* especially eclogue 3 on King Robert's death, he revised his style to accommodate

the social, moral, and political concerns of the latter; see Giovanni Boccaccio, *Eclogues,* trans. Janet Smarr (New York: Garland, 1987), pp. xxxv–l. For classical studies at the court of King Robert of Naples likely experienced by Boccaccio, see Francesco Tateo, "L'incremento degli studi classici," in Amaturo, *Petrarca,* pp. 41–78, esp. pp. 65–70.

3. Modern editors have pieced together remnants from manuscripts and anthologies. See *Le rime di Giovanni Boccaccio,* ed. Aldo Francesci Massèra (Bologna: Romagnoli dall'Acqua, 1914); and *Le rime,* ed. Vittore Branca (Milan: Mondadori, 1964), vol. 5.1 of *Tutte le opere,* ed. Vittore Branca, 10 vols. (Milan: Mondadori, 1964–83), pp. 3–31, from which I quote. These editions attribute 124 (Massèra) or 126 (Branca) poems to Boccaccio and regard another forty or fifty as doubtful attributions.

4. For this code name in Boccaccio's early prose see Braden, *Petrarchan Love,* pp. 63–72. For autobiographical references in the *Rime,* see Rosario Ferreri, "Studi sulle rime del Boccaccio," *Studi sul Boccaccio* 7 (1973): 213–37.

5. In the fiction of *Filocolo* 5.8 the daughter of the king of Franconarcos has a child fathered by the Tuscan shepherd Eucomos, identified by commentators as Boccaccio's father; see *Il Filocolo,* trans. Donald Cheney (New York: Garland Press, 1985), pp. 379–81. See also 1.1 and 1.44 (pp. 4, 46) for the analogous story of Florio and Biancafiore, which the royal beloved asks her lover to narrate to her.

6. Freud, *Standard Works,* p. 237. Freud earlier speculates that "the liberation of an individual, as he grows up, from the authority of his parents is one of the most necessary though one of the most painful results brought about by the course of his development. It is quite essential that it should occur and it may be presumed that it has been to some extent achieved by every one who has reached a normal state" (9.235).

7. See Branca, ed. For later writings on these Greco-French origins, see Stefano Ugo Baldassarri and Arielle Saiber, eds. and trans., *Images of Quattrocento Florence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), esp. Poliziano's summary and revision of Boccaccio's account, pp. 35–36. Lorenzo de' Medici might have had a similar mythology in mind when he composed his family emblem, "Le tems revient" 'Time returns'; for relations between Lorenzo's emblem and Botticelli's "La Primavera," see Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1958), pp. 116–17.

8. In Angelo Solerti, ed., *Le vite di Dante, Petrarca, e Boccaccio* (Milan: Francesco Vallardi, 1904), pp. 680–93, quoted from p. 682; trans. in David Thompson and Alan Nagel, *The Three Crowns of Florence* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 94.

9. In Solerti, ed., pp. 695–98.

10. For Neapolitan cosmopolitanism resulting from Spanish Aragonese efforts to create a Mediterranean empire that would divorce Naples from northern Italy, see Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in*

the Later Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 135–47; and Helene Wieruszowski, *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1971), pp. 185–222. For Spanish impact upon the language and culture of Naples, see Caterina Tristano, "Scrivere il volgare in Italia medidionale (secole XII–XV)," in *Lingue e culture dell'Italia meridionale, 1200–1600,* ed. Paolo Trovato (Rome: Bonacci, 1993), pp. 7–26; and Livio Petrucci "Il volgare a Napoli in età angiona," in the same volume, pp. 27–72. For Boccaccio's estimate of Naples, see Pasquale Alberto De Lisio, *Gli anni della svolta* (Salerno: Società Editrice Salernitana, 1976), pp. 137–56.

11. See Rosario Ferreri, "Ovidio e le *Rime* di Giovanni Boccaccio," *Forum Italicum* 8 (1974): 46–55.

12. For Petrarch's canonical pantheon as explained by Vellutello, see earlier discussion . For Boccaccio's relationship with Petrarch, see Billanovich, *Petrarca letterato,* pp. 57–294, esp. pp. 83 ff. and p. 127 for Sennuccio's responsibility in leading him to Petrarch's *Rime sparse* and *Bucolicum Carmen;* Branca, *Boccaccio medioevale,* pp. 300–332; and Velli, *Petrarca e Boccaccio,* pp. 61–96.

13. In a letter written at that time Boccaccio celebrated Dante's immersion in poetry and philosophy, "omissum a multis retroactis seculis fontem" 'a fountain abandoned by many past ages,' but he proclaimed a yet closer relationship with Petrarch, "preceptor meus" 'my guide' in having restored their "pristinam claritatem" 'original brilliance"; see Epistle 19 in *Opere* 5.1, ed. Branca, pp. 666. Curiously, in a letter written upon Petrarch's death, Boccaccio praises *Africa* ("celeste opus" 'a heavenly work') and the *Trionfi* ("quid de libello" 'especially that small book') but neglects to mention the *Rime sparse;* see Epistole 24 in *Opere* 5.1, ed. Branca, pp. 732–34.

14. Quoted from Boccaccio, *Opere,* ed. Branca, vol. 6: *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia,* ed. Giorgio Padoan (Turin: Einaudi, 1965), p. 334. For studies of these lectures, see Giorgio Padoan, *L'ultima opera di Giovanni Boccaccio: Le Esposizioni sopra il Dante* (Padua: Cedan, 1959), pp. 1–59; and Giorgio Padoan, *Il Boccaccio, le muse, il Parnaso e l'Arno* (Florence: Olschki, 1978), pp. 229–46.

15. For a survey of Florentine cultural developments, see Riccardo Fubini, *Quattrocento fiorentino: Politica, diplomazia, cultura* (Pisa: Pacini, 1997); the comprehensive collection of essays by various scholars in *La Toscana al tempo di Lorenzo il Magnifico: Politice, economia, cultura, arte,* 3 vols. (Pisa: Pacini, 1996), esp. Paolo Trovato, "Il libro toscano dell'età di Lorenzo," 2.525–63; McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance,* pp. 147–83; and Peter Godman, *From Poliziano to Machiavelli: Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

16. For Leonardo Bruni's Republican account in his *Historiae* of its foundation by Sulla, see Baldassarri and Saiber, eds., *Images,* pp. 12–17, and, for Angelo Poliziano's imperialist account of its foundation by Augustus, expressed in a letter to Piero de' Medici, see pp. 32–36; for other texts discussed in the following pages, see pp. 125–59 and 169–84.

17. For the published works, see Lorenzo de' Medici, *Opere,* ed. Attilio Simioni, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1913–14). See the generous selection of translations from these texts in Jon Thiem, *Lorenzo de' Medici: Selected Poems and Prose* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991). The most comprehensive study of Florentine poetry from 1378 to 1478 remains Francesco Flamini, *La lirica toscana del Rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico* (Pisa: T. Nistri, 1891), with reference to the Petrarchism of Giovanni da Prato, Niccolò Tinucci, and Roselli Rosello on pp. 393–410; and Mariotto Davanzati, Domenico da Prato, and others on pp. 436–76. For a selection of various poetic forms, see Antonio Lanza, ed., *Lirici toscani del Quattrocento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1973). For a superb analysis of fifteenth-century love poetry as historical documentation responding to the stresses of particular times and places, see Lauro Martines, *Strong Words: Writing and Social Strain in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 82–112.

18. For Lorenzo's efforts to enhance his public image and display his effectiveness as the master of a collaborative *bottega* (workshop) of politicians and intellectuals, see Melissa Meriam Bullard, *Lorenzo Il Magnifico: Image and Anxiety, Politics and Finance* (Florence: Olschki, 1994), pp. 43–79 and 109–30. For changing modes of literary patronage in Florence in the 1480s encouraging such experiments, see Alison Brown, *The Medici in Florence: The Exercise and Language of Power* (Florence: Olschki, 1992), pp. 247–62. For contemporary estimation of Lorenzo's poetry, see Paolo Orvieto, *Lorenzo de' Medici* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1976), pp. 37–53. For Lorenzo's development in the company of Pulci, Ficino, Pico, and Poliziano, see Mario Martelli, "La cultura letteraria nell'età di Lorenzo," in *Lorenzo the Magnificent,* ed. Michael Mallett and Nicholas Mann (London: Warburg Institute, 1996), pp. 167–76.

19. For the chronology of Lorenzo's composition, see Tiziano Zanato, *Saggio sul "Comento" di Lorenzo de' Medici* (Florence: Olschki, 1979). Zanato postulates an early composition of some poems in the late 1460s and the rest with prose commentary in three stages, first between 1473–78, then between 1484–86, and revisions in 1490–91. For the predominance of Petrarchan antithesis, anaphora, and lexical choices in Lorenzo's lyrics, see Tiziano Zanato, "Lorenzo lirico," in *Lorenzo de' Medici: New Perspectives,* ed. Bernard Toscani (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), pp. 107–29.

20. See James Wyatt Cook's introduction to his translation (retitled from the original), *The Autobiography of Lorenzo de' Medici The Magnificent: A Commentary on My Sonnets* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995), pp. 1–23. I quote Cook's translation throughout this chapter. For earlier views on Lorenzo's poetic ambitions, see Bruno Maier, "Il realismo letterario di Lorenzo il Magnifico," in Lorenzo de' Medici, *Opere scelte,* ed. Bruno Maier (Novara: Istituto Geografico de Agostini, 1969), pp. 1–49.

21. For the social and moral climate of Petrarchan poetry before Lorenzo, one might consider the work of Francesco Alberti (1401–79). A kinsman of Leon Bat-

tista Alberti, a friend of Cristoforo Landino, and an ally of the Medici, Alberti was raised in a wealthy merchant milieu, was exiled for his partisan attachments but was later vindicated and was alternately attracted to the *poesia giocosa* and *poesia burlesca* dominating Florence's bourgeois culture. Perhaps because his sentiments about Florentine politics were so mobile, Alberti could parody Petrarch's canzone 128, "Italia mia," in "Firenze mia," in which he gloats that "alfin ti se' ridotta / scelerata e corretta" 'finally you [Florence] are in dire straits, infamous, and depraved' (Lanza, ed., *Lirici toscani,* poem XCIII, ll. 14–15, p. 116). In a sonnet addressed to a friend detained at Avignon, he suggests that there rather than in Florence his friend can prosper near "di Valchiusa il fonte ornato e degno, / che fé 'l nostro Petrarca uscir di schiera" 'the adorned and worthy fountain of Vaucluse that separated Petrarch from the crowd'—and he concludes that southern France trumps invidious Florence, "ché quella è patria sua ch'è più tranquilla" 'because one's true fatherland is the place that is more tranquil' (Lanza ed., poem XCIV, p. 119). Just as Petrarch had distinguished his spiritual home from his ancestral progenitors' site of origin, so Alberti distinguishes his patriotic feelings from tribal attachment. For Alberti's cultural context, see Flamini, *Lirica toscana,* pp. 410–36. For Alberti's use of various styles and genres as a mode of solace, self-inquiry, and oblique revenge, see Martines, *Strong Words,* pp. 137–66. For *poesia giocosa* and *poesia burlesca,* see Alan K. Smith, "Fraudomy: Reading Sexuality and Politics in Burchiello," in *Queering the Renaissance,* ed. Jonathan Goldberg (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 84–106.

22. The poetry of Mariotto Davanzati (1410–?) exemplifies this culture. As an ally of Piero di Cosimo, Davanzati pursued a low-key political career, but he contributed enthusiastically to the literary circle of Feo Belcari, Francesco Accolti, and Antonio di Meglio. His poetry regularly associates Petrarch's high style with the cultural exclusivity of this circle. Thus he commends one of his fellow poets as "del Petrarca ver figlio adottivo, / ché dal vulgo ti veggo isciolto e privo" 'true adoptive son of Petrarch, because I see you free and separated from the common crowd' (Lanza, ed., poem XII, p. 428). In a group of poems about the death of his beloved, her virtues exceed those of Beatrice and Laura: "Onde Dante m'arossa e 'l mio Petrarca, / veggendo or posto alle lor donne un velo / per lei" 'Whence Dante and my Petrarch blush, seeing now a veil laid over their ladies by her' (poem XXXII, p. 437). Her spiritual refinement redeems the material vulgarity of his ambition and lessens the moral scruples that he is beginning to have about accumulated wealth and conspicuous consumerism in his native city. Davanzati's Petrarchism exposes fissures within the individualist values which drive Florentine politics. For Davanzati's historical context, see Flamini, *Lirica toscana,* pp. 436–70. For the heterodox reception of Petrarchism, see Giancarlo Mazzacurati, *Il problemo storico del petrarchismo italiano* (Naples: Liguori, 1963), pp. 66–74. For the rise of consumerism and the demand for religious art in response to moral anxiety about wealth, see Richard Goldthwaite, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300–1600* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 99–108, 129–40,

and 243–55. For the circulation of poetry in printed as well as handcrafted books as a fetishized commodity at the end of the fifteenth century, see Lisa Jardine, *Worldly Goods* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 1996), pp. 135–80; and Paula Findlen, "Possessing the Past: The Material World of the Italian Renaissance," *American Historical Review* 103 (1998): 83–114. For estimates of the cultural milieu in Cosimo's republic by different generations of Florentine humanists, see Brown, *Medici in Florence,* pp. 3–52.

23. See William J. Kennedy, "Humanist Classifications of Poetry among the Arts and Sciences," in Glyn Norton, ed., *The Renaissance,* vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 91–97.

24. See Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 23–46 and 47–95. For a precedent by Donizio Calderini whose *Observationes* on Propertius (1475) had abandoned the format of line-by-line commentary in favor of various treatises on limited topics, see Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship,* 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983–93), 1.14–70.

25. Actual practices of late medieval reading of course varied considerably among the aristocracy, clergy, gentry, and commercial populace according to specific contexts, but among professional exegetes in a Scholastic setting this Augustinian principle prevailed at least in theory. For St. Augustine, see chap. 1 n. 10. For varied practices based on Augustinian hermeneutics, see Brian Stock, *Implications of Literacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), pp. 88–240. For the rhetorical character of academic commentary as hermeneutic performance, see Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 151–78; for classical texts in the service of scriptural literacy, see Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Classical Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 17–41; and, for pragmatic examples of such reading, see Christopher Baswell, *Virgil in Medieval England: Figuring the "Aeneid" from the "Divine Comedy" to Chaucer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 47–63, 86–119, and 136–42; and Laurel Amtower, *Engaging Words: The Culture of Reading in the Later Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 79–120. For Bernard of Sylvester's archetypal privileging of poetic ambiguity and indeterminacy over historical or philological context, see Peter Godman, *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and Its Censors in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 228–93. For the uneven emergence of private silent reading calculated by word separation to foster quicker comprehension, see Paul Saenger, *Space between Words: Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 256–78; for late-fifteenth-century preferences for reading aloud in groups, see Joyce Coleman, *Public Reading and the Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 109–47. For concrete examples of late medieval and early humanist theory and criticism, see A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott, eds, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100–1375: The*

Commentary Traditions (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); and Michael Caesar, ed., *Dante: The Critical Heritage, 1314–1870* (London: Routledge, 1989).

26. See Craig Kallendorf, "Cristoforo Landino's *Aeneid* and the Humanist Critical Tradition," *Renaissance Quarterly,* 36 (1983): 519–46; Francesca La Brasca, "Tradition exégétique et vulgarisation néoplatonicienne dans la partie doctrinale du commentaire dantesque de C. Landino," in *Culture et société en Italie du moyen-âge á la Renaissance: Homage à André Rochon* (Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle [CIRRI], 1985); and "Du prototype à l'archétype: lecture allégorique . . . dans le commentaire dantesque de C. Landino," in *Scritture di scritture/ Testi, generi, modelli nel Rinascimento,* ed. Giancarlo Mazzacurati and Michel Plaisance (Rome: Bulzoni, 1987).

27. *Disputationes Camaldulenses,* ed. Peter Lohe (Florence: Sansoni, 1980), pp. 124–25; trans. Thomas H. Stahel, S.J., "Cristoforo Landino's Allegorization of the 'Aeneid': Books III and IV of the 'Camaldolese Disputations' " (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1968), p. 61. For analysis, see Mario Di Cesare, "Cristoforo Landino: The Virgilian Commentator and Critic as Hero," in *The Early Renaissance,* Acta, vol. 9 (1982), ed. Anthony L. Pellegrini (Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1985), pp. 19–32.

28. *Publii Vergilii Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis,* with the commentaries of Servius, Donatus, Probus, and Cristoforo Landino (Venice: Bernardino Stagnin, 1507), sig. Cvi^{r}. Arthur Field speculates that Landino had already composed some of his notes in the 1460s, "A Manuscript of Cristoforo Landino's First Lectures on Virgil," *Renaissance Quarterly* 31 (1978): 17–20.

29. See Vittore Branca, *Poliziano e l'umanesimo della parola* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), pp. 1–36; for the scientism of the Paduan school, see John Herman Randall Jr., *The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science* (Padua: Antenore, 1961). Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* would remain largely unknown in Italy and throughout Europe, the former until Francisco Robortello's commentary and Segni's Italian translation, both in 1548, the latter overshadowed by Cicero and Quintilian despite Latin translations of it by George of Trebizond in 1447–55 and Ermolao Barbaro in 1484. See George Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), pp. 195–205. For Poliziano's alternative "Alexandrian" focus on critical pluralism, historical relativism, and attention to noncanonical minor texts as the antithesis of neo-Aristotelian dogmatism, see Godman, *From Poliziano to Machiavelli,* pp. 31–79, esp. pp. 59–64.

30. The *Miscellanea* revolutionized classical scholarship and literary criticism with the quality and the quantity of its precise observation. In a celebrated entry on the proper spelling of *Vergil* rather than *Virgil,* for example, Poliziano describes his inductive approach of collecting hard and conclusive evidence about the past, and he compares it to gathering seashells at random on the beach, "ceu si littoribus ex commodo inambulans, conchas interim colligam securus" 'as if walking carefree at leisure along the shores, I would sometimes gather shells.' Information may

come to the fore in unlikely ways, and it may lead to startling conclusions. Thus Poliziano recounts that he has found proof about the ancient spelling of the poet's name in an inscription of *Vergilius* on a Roman tomb. Hard stone has withstood the passage of time better than haphazardly transcribed medieval texts, and it therefore carries more authority: "Monimenta ista tanta seculorum uetustate roborata, mihi satis ad presidium sint" 'Monuments of this sort, reinforced by such duration through the centuries, should be proof enough for me' (287). The poet, he reasons, should henceforth be known as "Vergil," not "Virgil." Quotations from Poliziano, *Opere,* ed. Ida Maier, 3 vols. (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1970–71), p. 286.

31. "Commentary on the *Commedia,*" in Nagel-Thompson, trans., *Three Crowns,* pp. 113–14. For the conflict between Landino's Italian nationalism and Dante's imperialism, see Deborah Parker, *Commentary and Ideology,* pp. 76–90.

32. The date was 1466–67, one year before he revised his first lectures on Virgil; see Arthur Field, "Cristoforo Landino's First Lectures on Dante," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39 (1986): 16–48. esp. pp. 31–32. For political motives, see Mario Santoro, "Cristoforo Landino e il Volgare," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 131 (1954): 501–47; and Cecil Grayson, "Lorenzo, Machiavelli, and the Italian Language," *Italian Renaissance Studies,* ed. Ernest Fraser Jacob (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), pp. 410–32.

33. Cristoforo Landino, *Scritti critici e teorici,* ed. Roberto Cardini, 2 vols. (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974), 1.40.

34. Landino extends this program the following year when in the prolusion to his lectures on Virgil he addresses Lorenzo's father, Piero de' Medici. Landino wants this commentary to provide useful instruction "in que parens tuus Laurentius haec investigans inducitur" 'in whatever your son Lorenzo might be persuaded as he investigates them' (216). Both in Virgil's poetic text and in the Medici's political rule Landino finds examples of the highest order: "Hoc auctore ac duce maiestatis publicae dignitas, quae pene iam extincta esset, non solum in pristinum gradum revocata est, sed amplior multoque illustrior reddita" 'In this author and this ruler the worth of public greatness, which is now almost extinguished elsewhere, is not only called back to its original condition, but is also restored more fully and more clearly' (222). Literature provides a mirror for the ruler's actions and a rhetoric by which to justify them. For Lorenzo's ideas on the usefulness of a philosophically literate citizenry, see Arthur Field, *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 231–68.

35. For the attribution to Poliziano, see Mario Santoro, "Poliziano o il Magnifico," *Giornale italiano di filologia* 1 (1948): 139–49; but see also Sara Sturm, "The Case for Lorenzo's Authorship of the *Epistola,*" *Renaissance and Reformation* 8 (1971): 69–78. For Lorenzo's political interests in 1476, see Mazzacurati, *Problema,* pp. 95–108; and Judith Bryce, "Lorenzo de Medici, Piombino, and Naples: Cultural Politics from the *Raccolte Aragonese* to the *Comento*" in *Essays in Italian Literature and History in Honour of Doug Thompson*, ed. George Talbot and Pamela Williams (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), pp. 11–27.

36. Compare Lorenzo's sensitivity to contingency in the figurative language of his letters analyzed in Bullard, *Image and Anxiety,* pp. 81–108.

37. For analysis of specific texts, see William J. Kennedy, "Petrarchan Figurations of Death in Lorenzo de' Medici's Sonnets and *Comento,*" in *Life and Death in Fifteenth-Century Florence,* ed. Marcel Tetel, Ronald G. Witt, and Rona Goffen (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989), pp. 46–67.

38. For the political background, see Nicolai Rubinstein, *The Government of Florence under the Medici, 1434 to 1494,* rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 199–263. For a superb analysis of Lorenzo's sensitivity to contingency in the figurative language of diplomacy, see Bullard, *Image and Anxiety,* pp. 81–108, based upon a detailed study of the Medici letters.

39. For the ritual significance of Lorenzo's public displays of innocence and martyrdom linking the Medici to the fate of the community, see Richard Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Academic Press, 1980), pp. 419–90, esp. pp. 428–62. For rituals promoted in the confraternities, see Ron Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence* (New York: 1982), pp. 169–72.

40. For Lorenzo's creative recycling of multiple forms, see Giancarlo Mazzacurati, "Storia e funzione della poesia lirica nel *Comento* di Lorenzo de' Medici," *MLN* 104 (1989): 48–67. For Lorenzo's analogous efforts to incorporate monuments of earlier culture in the Medici palace as a museum of rare antiquities, see Trexler, *Public Life,* pp. 444–52. For a shift of emphasis from authority to self-knowledge and personal experience, see Sherry Roush, *Hermes' Lyre: Italian Poetic Self-Commentary from Dante to Campanella* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), pp. 71–95.

41. For the influence of Ficino's Neoplatonism on Petrarchan modes of *consolatio,* see George McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 132–54.

42. Historically, this figure has its basis in Platonic philosophy, in which the skills of the *medicus*/*therapos* become obsolete as soon as the patient is cured. In the Latin translation of Plato by Ficino, who advertised himself as a man of medicine, a *medicus,* the figure functions as a trope for the plight of Socrates. Medicine is a science of love, the art of generating harmony and concord among opposites. Socrates himself is a physician of love (*Symposium* 185c–188e). In *Philebus,* however, he confronts the limit of his own powers. After physicians establish a healthy ratio between warring opposites, they do not try to make the patient healthier by passing beyond this ratio. If they did, they would only upset the balance and give the patient a new disease. Having reached the end, physicians must release their patients. In a healthy state of body and soul, including that of the body politic and the communal soul, these *medici,* along with Socrates, will become obsolete (*Philebus* 26d). References to Ficino's Latin translations of Plato are to Plato, *Opera,* ed. R. B. Hirtschig, 2 vols. (Paris: Ambrosio Firmin-Didot, 1891). For Ficino's self-representation as a *medicus* who condemns not the poets but their misinterpreters, thereby placing the poets in the company of philosophers, see

Michael J. B. Allen, *Synoptic Art: Marsilio Ficino on the History of Platonic Interpretation* (Florence: Olschki, 1998), pp. 93–123. For Ficino's conception of exegesis and use of exegetical technique as apologetics, see James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance,* 2 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), 1.341–59.

43. For the pun on Medici, see Kennedy, "Petrarchan Figurations." For examples of the pun in visual art, see John Shearman, *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel* (London: Phaidon, 1972), pp. 77–80; and Janet Cox-Rearick, *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 15–40 and 248; for Poliziano's account of Lorenzo's death, see Godman, *From Poliziano to Machiavelli,* pp. 3–30.

44. For Lorenzo's vision of a new sort of state with a new sort of leader as imagined by Guicciardini, see Alison Brown, "Lorenzo and Guicciardini," in Mallett and Mann, *Lorenzo the Magnificent,* pp. 281–96.

45. See Trexler, *Public Life,* pp. 444–62; and Martines, *Strong Words,* pp. 98–100.

46. For critical text with detailed biography, see *Le Rime di Benedetto Gareth, detto il Chariteo,* ed. Erasmo Pèrcopo, 2 vols. (Naples: Accademia delle Scienze, 1892). For Cariteo in the context of Neapolitan humanism, see Antonio Altamura, *L'Umanesimo nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia* (Florence: Bibliopolis, 1941), pp. 161–86. For artistic background, see George Hersey, *Alfonso II and the Artistic Renewal of Naples* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). For political background, see Ernesto Pontieri, *Per la storia del regno di Ferrante I d'Aragona,* 2d ed. (Naples: Edizione Scientifiche Italiane, 1969), pp. 591–624; and Nino Cortese, *Cultura e politica a Napoli dal Cinque al Settecento* (Naples: Edizione Scientifiche Italiane, 1965), pp. 31–66.

47. For the evolution of Cariteo's style between these editions, see Enrico Fenzi, "La lingua e lo stile del Cariteo dalla prima alla seconda redazione dell'*Endimione,*" *Studi di Filologia e Letteratura* 1 (1970): 9–83.

48. For the political self-consciousness of Naples in the early sixteenth century, see Aurelio Lepre, *Storia del mezzogiorno d'Italia,* vol. 1: *La lunga durata e la crisi 1500–1656* (Naples: Liguori, 1986), pp. 11–163; for its feudal character, see Tommaso Astarita, *The Continuity of Feudal Power: The Caracciolo di Brienza in Spanish Naples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 1–15.

49. For the structure of the sequence, see Marco Santagata, *La lirica aragonese* (Padua: Antenori, 1979), pp. 307–30. For a further analysis of these texts, see William J. Kennedy, "Citing Petrarch in Naples: The Politics of Commentary in Cariteo's *Endimione,*" *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002): 1196–1221.

50. For the fusion of Petrarchan diction with Horatian and Ovidian motifs, see Rino Consolo, "Il libro di *Endimione:* Modelli classici, 'inventio' ed 'elocutio' nel canzoniere del Cariteo," *Filologia e critica* 3 (1978): 19–94; for Cariteo's debt to Propertius, see Claudia Fanti, "L'elegia properziana nella lirica amorosa del Cariteo," *Italianistica* 14 (1985): 22–44.

51. For a detailed reading of *Endimione* in the context of Neapolitan poetry, see Santagata, *La lirica aragonese,* pp. 88–96, 171–81, and 242–76. For a selection of Neapolitan poetry with critical commentary, see Antoni Altamura, ed., *La lirica napoletana del Quattrocento* (Naples: Società editrice Napoletana, 1978). For additional background, see Antonio Altamura, *L'umanesimo nel mezzogiorno d'Italia* (Florence: Bibliopolis, 1941), pp. 161–86; and Mario Santoro, "Humanism in Naples," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, Legacy,* ed. Albert Rabil Jr., vol. 1: *Humanism in Italy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), pp. 296–331.

52. For these political events, see Lepre, *Storia del mezzogiorno,* pp. 165–220.

53. For the crisis of Italian legitimization founded on the collective desire of subjected citizens for political stability and economic prosperity, see Pierangelo Schiera, "Legitimacy, Discipline, and Institutions: Three Necessary Conditions for the Birth of the Modern State," in Kirshner, *Origins of the State,* pp. 11–33. For the monarchical model of the Papal States as an alternative to the courtly model of the northern communes, see Paolo Prodi, *The Papal Prince: One Body and Two Souls: The Papal Monarchy in Early Modern Europe,* trans. Susan Haskins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 107–10 and 157–81.

54. The monarchy of Aragonese Naples had been the major source of artistic patronage in the old days, and its preferences continued to dominate the tastes of the Neapolitan Academy after the Spanish installation; see Jerry H. Bentley, *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 48–69, 202–22, and 241–87; Francesco Tateo, *L'Umanesimo meridionale* (Bari: Laterza, 1976), pp. 121–33 and 189–208; and Pasquale Alberto de Lisio, *Gli Anni della svolta: Tradizione umanistica e viceregno nel primo Cinquecento napolitano* (Salerno: Società Editrice Salernitana, 1976, pp. 11–36.

55. For the choice of the northern Italian dialect over the Spanish language in Neapolitan court poetry, see Mario Compagna, Perrone Capone, and Lia Vozzo Mendìa, "La scelta dell'italiano tra i scrittori iberici alla corte Aragonese," in *Lingue e culture dell'Italia meridonale,* ed. Paolo Trovato (Rome: Bonacci, 1993), pp. 163–78; and Francesco Sabatini, *Napoli angioina: cultura e società* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1975), pp. 117–46 and 213–18.

56. For Sannazaro's precedent in revising his Neapolitan sonnets, some of which may have been composed as early as 1478, so as to conform to Bembo's precepts about Petrarchan diction, see Gianfranco Folena, *La crisi linguistica del quattrocento e "Arcadia"* (Florence: Olschki, 1952); Pier Vincenzio Mengaldo, "La lirica volgare del Sannazaro e lo sviluppo del linguagio poetico rinascimentale," *La rassegna della letteratura italiana* 65 (1962): 436–82; Carlo Dionisotti, "Appunti sulle rime del Sannazaro," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 140 (1963): 161–211; and William J. Kennedy, *Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of Pastoral* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1983), pp. 37–59.

57. See Raymond A. Prier, "Naming the Rose: Petrarch's Figure in and for the Text and Texts," in *Countercurrents: On the Primacy of Texts in Literary Criticism,*

ed. R. A. Prier (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), pp. 275–99; and Prier, "Neapolitan *Imitationes Propertianiae:* Ancient Sound in the Verses of Pontano and Charitеo," in *Reconsidering the Renaissance,* ed. Mario Di Cesare (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies and Texts, 1992), pp. 89–108.

58. For Gonsalvo, see Lepre, *Storia del Mezzogiorno,* pp. 183–214; and Aurelio Cernigliaro, *Sovrantà e feudo nel Regno di Napoli, 1505–1557,* 2 vols. (Naples: Jovene, 1983), 1.34–43.

59. For the development of a distinctively Neapolitan sense of statehood in response to its political domination by a distant Spain and its cultural attachment to the rest of Italy, see Aurelio Musi, *Mezzogiorno spagnolo: la via napoletana allo stato moderno* (Naples: Guida, 1991), pp. 39–58.

60. For the sixteenth-century infiltration of Petrarchism into the Neapolitan Academy, especially in the commentaries of Gesualdo and Sylvano da Venafro, in the theory of Minturno, and in the poetry of Bernardino Rota, Angelo di Costanzo, Luigi Tansillo, and Galeazzo di Tàrsia, see Giulio Ferroni and Amedeo Quondam, *La locuzione artificiosa: Teoria ed esperienza della lirica a Napoli nell'età del mannierismo* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1973), pp. 11–72 and 209–33.

61. For formative notions of Italian identity in the early sixteenth century, see Schiera, "Legitimacy, Institutions, and Discipline." For the papacy as a protonational model for pan-Italian bonding, see Prodi, *The Papal Prince,* pp. 107–10 and 157–81. Owing to its distance from Naples, Spain was impelled to grant regional satellites of the viceregal government large measures of autonomy. For the feudalization of the Neapolitan periphery in response to this condition, see Cernigliaro, *Sovranità e feudo,* 1.46–54.

62. For the function of the viceregal administration as a central government and its relation to local powers, see Musi, *Mezzogiorno spagnolo,* pp. 75–89.

63. For Ludovico il Moro, see Angelo Cellerino, "Il ducato di Milano dalla morte di Galeazzo Maria Sforza alla fine dell' independenza," in Andenna, *Comuni e signorie,* pp. 637–72.

64. For the stabilization of political power and of social and commercial interests under Spanish governance, see Musi, *Mezzogiorno spagnolo,* pp. 133–52.

65. For the theme of adversity and bad fortune as a recurrent topos in Neapolitan literature, see Mario Santoro, *Fortuna, ragione, e prudenze nella civiltà letteraria del cinquecento* (Naples: Liguori, 1978), pp. 15–69.

66. For the emergence of a Petrarchan voice expressive of moral conscience, see Aldo Scaglione, "Classical Heritage and Petrarchan Self-Consciousness in the Literary Emergence of the Interior I," in *Modern Critical Views: Petrarch,* ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea Press, 1989), pp. 125–37. For poetic theory in early sixteenth-century Naples, see De Lisio, *Gil anni della svolta,* pp. 83–136.

67. See Pèrcopo, ed., "Introduzione," pp. xl–xli; and "Documenti," pp. cclxxiv; and Giovanni Parenti, *Benet Garet: Profilo* (Florence: Olschki, 1993).

68. For mannerist uses of Petrarchan symmetries, antitheses, and oxymorons, see Aldo Scaglione, "Cinquecento Mannerism and the Uses of Petrarch," in-

Medieval and Renaissance Studies V, ed. O. B. Hardison (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971), pp. 122–55; and Amedeo Quondam, *La parola nel laberinto: Società e scrittura del Manierismo a Napoli* (Bari: Laterza, 1975), pp. 63–173.

69. For courtly alternatives to Bemboism in the Academy, see Riccardo Drusi, *La lingua "cortigiana romana"* (Venice: Il Cardo, 1995), pp. 93–141.

Four Du Bellay and the Language of Empire

1. For biography, see Henri Chamard, *Joachim Du Bellay, 1522–1560* (Lille, 1900; Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978); for Charles V and his universalist aims toward dynastic consolidation rather than political domination, see Helmut Koenigsberger, *The Hapsburgs and Europe, 1516–1660* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), pp. 1–62; for Charles's guiding principles and economic realities, see Manuel Fernández Alvarez, *Charles V: Elected Emperor and Hereditary Ruler,* trans. T. A. Lalaguna (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), pp. 49–56; for his imperial career as king of Spain, see A. W. Lovett, *Early Hapsburg Spain, 1517–1598* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 40–60; and Joseph Pérez, *Carlos V* (Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1999), pp. 61–105; for the blend of medieval constitutionalism, Renaissance humanism, and Neoscholasticism in his foreign policy, see J. A. Fernández-Santamarìa, *The State, War, and Peace: Spanish Political Thought in the Renaissance, 1516–1559* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 120–60; and John Lynch, *Spain, 1516–1598: From Nation State to World Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), pp. 95–137. *Phantom empire* is the term of Frances Yates, *Astrea* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 128 ff.

2. For the historical site of Augustan poetry as a discourse generating within itself a political context, see Duncan Kennedy, *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), esp. pp. 83–100 on Propertius; for political perceptions of Augustan poetry and the social status of Roman poets, see Peter White, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 95–109; for metonymic modes that enable political allegory, see Gordon Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), pp. 162–88. For Roman poetry as representing counterfactual worlds in critical relation to the historical world, see Lowell Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 95–107.

3. I do not want to exaggerate the analogy, but the emphasis on a predominantly male-defined readership concerned more with personal loyalties than amatory situations has precedent in Provençal Troubadour poetry three centuries earlier. For the androcentric vocabulary of masculine loyalties and proprietary relationships which overshadows amatory relationships between men and women in Provençal Troubadour poetry, see Rouben Cholakian, *The Troubadour Lyric: A*

Psychological Reading (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), pp. 181–90; for notions of status dictated by a competitive masculine economy with conditions of performance which encouraged fictional constructions of the poet's role, see Sarah Kay, *Subjectivity in Troubadour Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 84–131. For the shift from the knight's individualistic ethos toward becoming a diplomatically adroit servant of rulers, see Linda Peterson, *The World of the Troubadours: Medieval Occitan Society c. 1000–1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 279–304. For the courtly idealization of the woman as an overdetermined deprecation of the feminine in love lyrics that have less to do with women than with the poet's relation to the self and superiors, see R. Howard Bloch, Medieval *Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 143–64; and Gale Sigal, "The Pit or the Pedestal? The Dichotomization of the Lady in Troubadour Lyric," *Romanic Review* 84 (1993): 109–42. For feminine tastes in the French court under the influence of Catherine de' Medici, Diane de Poitiers, and Marguerite de Valois, see Marie-Madeleine Fragonard, *Les dialogues du prince et du poète* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), pp. 58–60.

4. For divisions of rank in sixteenth-century northern French society, see Robert Mandrou, *An Introduction to Modern France,* trans. R. E. Hallmark (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976), pp. 77–138. For appurtenances of kinship, lineage, race, and household, see Jean-Louis Flandrin, *Families in Former Times,* trans. Richard Southern (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 11–39; for the rise of a new social class of officeholders intermediary between the merchant bourgeoisie and the older nobility, with aspirations toward the privileges but not the way of life of the latter, see George Huppert, *Les Bourgeois Gentilhommes: An Essay on the Definition of Elites in Renaissance France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 24–33. For a highly differentiated quadripartite division of society on three levels based on the fourteenth-century account of Petrarch's friend Philippe de Mézières, see Philippe Contamine, *La France au XIV^e^ et XV^e^ siècles* (London: Variorum Reprint, 1981), pp. 132–38. Modern discussions of class distinctions owe much to Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society,* trans. L. A. Manyon, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), esp. 1.231–40, 2.332–44, and 2.441–47. See Thomas Bisson, "The 'Feudal' Revolution," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6–42. For the anachronism of the term *feudal* in such contexts, and its compromising usage by sixteenth-century academic lawyers to reconcile customary law with the authority of Roman Law, see Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 22–47 and 288–322. For the transposition from the ideology of adventure to an ideology of courtliness, see Michael Nerlich, *Ideology of Adventure: Studies in Modern Consciousness, 1100–1750,* trans. Ruth Crawley, 2 vols. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), pp. 14–19 and 284–307.

5. The major complicating factor in this changing social order was an emerging distinction between the long-standing military and largely provincial *noblesse*

d'épée and the emerging courtly and bureaucratic *noblesse de robe,* as detailed in John H. M. Salmon, *Society in Crisis: France in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1975), pp. 19–113; for ties that bind these orders, see Claude de Seyssel's delineation "of the harmony and agreement of the three estates" in *La grande monarchie* 1.19 (1515; published 1519) translation in *The Monarchy of France,* trans. J. H. Hexter (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), p. 65. Seyssel understands social mobility positively in terms of cooperative rather than rivalrous relations among various factions: "If there were no hope of mounting from one to the other [estate] or if it were too difficult, overbold men could induce others of the same estate to conspire against the other two" (1.17, p. 63). For bargaining power and space to maneuver across these orders, see Kristen Neuschell, *Word of Honor: Interpreting Noble Culture in Sixteenth-Century France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 16–25 and 196–206.

6. The sixteenth-century nobility thought of its privileges as attached to the traditional profession of arms, with its claims to wealth inhering in fixed land and property rights. The developing bureaucratic nobility thought of its privileges as attached to the person, with ideas of fluid, malleable, mobile wealth conferred through favor and attachment. For the resilience of the nobility in adapting to changing economic conditions, see Jonathan Dewald, *The European Nobility, 1400–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 15–50. For the turn to an interiorized ethical model in Montaigne, see Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 134–97. For the increasingly problematic historical position of the nobility in the emerging nation-state with the resulting imperative to display the public performance of nobility, see David M. Posner, *The Performance of Nobility in Early Modern European Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 3–21.

7. See Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The Royal French State: Louis XI to Henri IV, 1460–1610,* trans. Juliet Vale (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 124–49.

8. For the duty of the military nobility to react against danger to the *patrie* even if its source is the monarch, see Arlette Jouanna, *Le devoir de revolte: La noblesse française at la gestation de l'état moderne* (Paris: Fayard, 1989), pp. 15–89; for the diversity and hierarchy of noble groups, see Jouanna, *La France du XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996), pp. 57–90; for the structure and composition of the court as the family of the king, see Jean Marie Constant, *La vie quotidienne de la noblesse française aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Paris: Hachette, 1985), pp. 35–56.

9. For Du Bellay's origins and cadet rank among four brothers, see Chamard, *Joachim Du Bellay,* pp. 14–26; for his relationship to Cardinal Jean du Bellay, see pp. 271–284; for the broader literary context, see Henri Chamard, *Histoire de la Pléiade,* 4 vols. (Paris: Henri Didier, 1939–40) 1.87–91.

10. For differences of rank in the mid-sixteenth-century court, see Jean Barbey, *Etre roi: Le roi et son gouvernement en France de Clovis à Louis XVI* (Paris: Fayard, 1992), pp. 261–89, 361–403.

11. Russell Major, *From Renaissance Monarchy to Absolute Monarchy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), pp. 100–103. After 1532, when François I began centralizing the treasury, commoners trained in commercial and notarial skills at regional and municipal schools gained access to administrative office which brought eligibility for competitive favors previously dispensed to aristocrats. For training in municipal schools and colleges throughout northern France, see George Huppert, *Public Schools in Renaissance France* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 29–59. For an inventory of such schools, see Dominique Julia and Marie-Madeleine Compère, *Collèges français, XVI^e^–XVIII^e^ siècles,* 2 vols. (Paris: INRP/CNRS, 1984–86); for patterns of enrollment in medicine, law, and theology in universities throughout France, see D. Julia, Jacques Revel, and Roger Chartier, eds., *Les universités européennes du XVI^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècles: Histoire sociale des populations etudiantes,* 2 vols. (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences, 1986–89), 2.303–94; for specific educational practices, see Julia, Compère, and Chartier, eds., *L'Education en France de 16^e^ au 18^e^ siècles* (Paris: Société d'Edition d'Enseignement Supérieur, 1976), pp. 21–36. For the rise of an amphibious cultural class of educators, schoolmasters, and higher preceptors, see Gilbert Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle dans la France des humanistes: Guillaume Budé et François I* (Geneva: Droz, 1997), pp. 65–92 and 143–66.

12. See Chamard, *Du Bellay,* pp. 26–37, for his years spent in Poitiers; pp. 42–66, for his time spent at Coqueret. For the profession of law as an academic discipline and as a set of power structures, see Donald R. Kelley, *The Beginning of Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 169–211.

13. Du Bellay had family connections in Italy; his cousin Cardinal Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey, had served as governor of Piedmont before his death in 1543, while Guillaume's brother, Cardinal Jean du Bellay, served as ambassador to the papal court of Paul IV. See Chamard, *Du Bellay,* pp. 271–84, 320–25; and V. L. Bourrilly, *Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey (1491–1543)* (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Edition, 1905), pp. 258–326. For Du Bellay's diplomatic activity in Rome, see Gladys Dickinson, *Du Bellay in Rome* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), pp. 124–47.

14. The most notable of these positions were those of secretaries of state (though the term was not used until 1559), to which Henry II had appointed four members of the nobility and a staff of assistants to provide liaisons between himself and the administrators of eleven frontier governments. See Nicola M. Sutherland, *The French Secretaries of State in the Age of Catherine de' Medici* (London: Athlone: 1962), pp. 19–34. For the evolution of the term *état* (state) from designating the king's private *status* or estate in the Middle Ages to designating an apparatus to enforce the public good and common welfare as *ratio status* (reason of state) in the early sixteenth century, see Alain Guéry, "The State," in *Rethinking France*, under the direction of Pierre Nora, vol. 1: *The State*, trans. Mary Trouille (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. 1–52, esp. pp. 6–25.

15. Quotations refer to Aris and Joukovsky, *Oeuvres poétiques,* p. 13. For Du

Bellay's sense of the exchange value of poetry as linked to its evidence of technical mastery, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 153–69.

16. For efforts to assert aristocratic distinction, see Mark Motley, *Becoming a French Aristocrat: The Education of the Courtly Nobility* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 68–99; and Ellery Schalk, *From Valor to Pedigree: Ideas of Nobility in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 174–204. For academic capital and cultural pedigree as ingredients in social standing, see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction,* trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. 63–96.

17. Castiglione ("Not only do the French not esteem, but they abhor letters, and consider all men of letters to be very base," *Book of the Courtier* 1.42; Singleton, trans., p. 67) and later Montaigne (in "Of the Education of Children," *Essays* 1.26; Frame, trans., p. 110) evoke the aversion of the French provincial nobility to learning, with its smug dismissal of education as unnecessary for its professional advancement; see Posner, *Performance of Nobility,* pp. 22–79. For Italian and French views of France as a "cultural Sparta," see Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 13–42 and, for the slow development of education among its nobility, pp. 115–42. For provincial education in both upper and lower classes, see Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The French Peasantry, 1450–1660,* trans. Alan Sheridan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 226–30; and Huppert, *Public Schools,* pp. 21–36 and 47–74.

18. Like Du Bellay and Ronsard, the latter were petty country seigneurs or landless members of the lesser aristocracy whose dreams of advancement were challenged by the rise of the bourgeoisie and the prosperity of the military elite during the Italian campaigns; see Salmon, *Society in Crisis,* pp. 92–113. For literary implications, see Margaret Ferguson, *Trials of Desire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 18–53; and Thomas M. Greene, "Regrets Only: Three Poetic Paradigms in Du Bellay," *Romanic Review* 84 (1993): 1–18.

19. Motley, *Becoming a French Aristocrat,* pp. 100–122.

20. See Le Roy Ladurie, *Royal French State,* pp. 109–23; and Fernand Braudel, *The Identity of France,* trans. Sian Reynolds, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 1.58–85. For interfaces between popular and elite culture in sixteenth-century France, see Robert Muchembled, *Popular Culture and Elite Culture,* trans. Lydia Cochrane (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), pp. 69–94.

21. The first numeral in parenthesis refers to quotations from *La Deffence,* ed. Chamard; the second numeral refers to Gladys Turquet's translation, which I quote throughout.

22. Braudel, *Identity of France,* pp. 85–103. For the clash of originary identity between Gallic and Frankish ancestry, see Krzysztof Pomian, "Franks and Gauls," *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* under the direction of Pierre Nora, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996–98), 1.27–76. For dialectology and place names as indicators of diversity among these ethnic groups, immigrant foreigners, and territorial units, see Pierre

Bonnaud, *Terres et langues, peuples et régions,* 2 vols. (Clermont-Ferrand: Euvernhà Tarà d'Oc, 1981), 1.201–65.

23. For the development in the writing of Pasquier, Bodin, and others of a self-consciousness about being French viewed as a sign of divine favor toward the nation, see Myriam Yardeni, *La conscience nationale en France pendant les guerres de religion* (Paris: Béatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1971), pp. 13–72; and Bell, *Cult of the Nation in France,* pp. 3–10.

24. See Le Roy Ladurie, *Royal French State,* p. 283. For historical roots of the French idea of citizenship as political and assimilationist rather than ethnocentric, see Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 34–49.

25. See Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 266–75; and Braudel, *Identity of France,* pp. 309–28. The German etymology may derive dialectically from the name of a weapon: cf. Old English *franka* (spear, javelin) used by the ancient Franks, conferring upon them their reputation for ferocity and enabling them to remain free from Roman domination. See *franc* in *Le grand Robert de la langue française*, 9 vols. (Paris: Robert, 1986), 4.686–89.

26. For the etymology of *franche* (free), see Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 281–88. For Etienne Pasquier's search for a national past through historical scholarship, see Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Langauge, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 271–99.

27. For literary intimations of national identity in sixteenth-century France by Ramus, Pasquier, Montaigne, and Bodin, see George Huppert, *Idea of Perfect History: Historical Erudition and Historical Philosophy in Renaissance France* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), pp. 72–87. See also Philippe Desan, *Penser l'histoire à la Renaissance* (Caen: Paradigme, 1993), esp. pp. 29–78.

28. Homer mentions only Astyanax as a son of Hector, prompting sixteenth-century Hellenists to invent various explanations for Francus' identity. For such uses of the Trojan myth, see Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 226–44. For the contributions of Pasquier, Postel, and Hotman in moving source study about the Franks and Gauls away from legends about the Trojan Francus and toward research based on humanist philology and documents about the Gauls, see George Huppert, *The Style of Paris* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), pp. 61–75; and Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History,* pp. 28–51.

29. The idea of the Greeks as descendants of the French Celts animates his *Illustrations de Gaul et singularitez de Troye* (1511–13) and *La Concorde des deux langages* (1511) with its praise of the "Troyenne nation" as one with the "peuple hardi" and "illustre sang" of France; see Zumthor, *Anthologie,* p. 168. For Lemaire's contribution to Gallic patriotism and Rabelais's later parody of patriotic sophistry in reaction to the imagined universal history of Annius of Viterbo, see Stephens, *Giants in Those Times,* pp. 139–84 and 214–89.

30. The title "Rex Christianissimus" was conferred upon Pepin by Pope

Stephen II in 754 to acknowledge Pepin's campaign against the Lombards and his conferral of the Papal States upon the pope. See Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 172–87.

31. Greenfeld, *Nationalism,* pp. 102–12. For the evolution of French boundaries and borders from the twelth to the fifteenth centuries, see Bernard Guenée, "From Feudal Boundaries to Political Borders," in *Rethinking France,* ed. Nora, pp. 81–103; for the consolidation of boundaries in the mid-sixteenth century, see Daniel Nordman, "From the Boundaries of the State to National Borders," in *Rethinking France,* ed. Nora, pp. 105–32, esp. pp. 105–13. For a sense of community in the French medieval kingdom, see Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* pp. 276–88.

32. J. Russell Major, *The Growth of Representative Government in Renaissance France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), pp. 47–59 and 161–85.

33. Seyssel, *Monarchy,* 1.12, p. 57. For Seyssel's concept of limited monarchism, see Le Roi Ladurie, *Royal French State,* pp. 54–78 and 109–23.

34. See Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* 224–50.

35. For the imperial ambitions of the Valois to resume the inheritance of Charlemagne which spurred Charles V's revenge at Pavia in 1525 and his increased efforts against France two decades later, see Gaston Zeller, *Aspects de la politique française sous l'Ancien Régime* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964), pp. 12–89; and Jean-Daniel Pariset, *Les relations entre la France et l'Allemagne au milieu du XVI^e^ siècle* (Strasbourg: Istra, 1981), pp. 102–15. For French expression of ties with Germanic rather than Mediterranean identity, see Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 319–45.

36. For "Soit ce nom / D'Olive véritable ou non," see Du Bellay's *Divers jeux rustiques,* ed. V. L. Saulnier (Geneva: Droz, 1947), p. 63. For Mme or Mlle de Viole, see Chamard, *Du Bellay,* pp. 177–79. For various anagrammatic possibilities, including ones on the motif of *vol* (flight) and *vie* (life), "O l'âme de ma vie / Madame Olive," "violé (tyran)," "and "viole (la liberté)," see François Rigolot, *Poétique et onomastique* (Geneva: Droz, 1977), pp. 137–54. For Minerva's sacred branch whose picking requires strenuous effort, see Floyd Gray, *La poétique de Du Bellay* (Paris: Nizet, 1978), pp. 27–40.

37. See Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* , pp. 24–27, 159–62, and 189–94. For the Spanish Empire, see Lynch, *Spain, 1516–1598,* pp. 78–94; and John H. Elliott, *Imperial Spain, 1469–1716* (London: Edward Arnolds, 1963), pp. 135–63.

38. The defeat of the separatist Castilian Comuneros in 1521 and the incorporation of Castile and Aragon into a greater Spanish political entity fueled their sentiment. See Perez, *Carlos V,* pp. 107–74; and Elliott, *Imperial Spain,* pp. 135–65. For cultural implications measured in the rise of Castilian poetry and the decadence of its Catalan counterpart, see Joan Ramòn Resina, "The Role of Discontinuity in the Formation of National Culture," in *Cultural Authority in Golden Age Spain,* ed. Marina Brownlee and Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 284–303.

39. For close analysis of their relationship, see Ignacio Navarrete, *Orphans of Petrarch* (Berekeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 73–125.

40. Quotations from Juan Boscán, *Obras,* ed. William Knapp, 3 vols. (Madrid: Murielo, 1875).

41. For the subsequent widening of Petrarchan figures of love to take in problems of exploration, conquest, and rule, see Roland Greene, *Unrequited Conquests,* esp. pp. 135–70 and 195–229.

42. The proposition of a *translatio studii* assumes, despite Petrarch's declaration of its impossibility, that Greco-Roman cultural supremacy has passed in a legitimate descent to sixteenth-century France and that modern forms such as the sonnet and canzone overtake not only medieval forms but classical ones as well. See Franco Simone, *The French Renaissance,* trans. H. Gaston Hall (London: Macmillan, 1969), pp. 223–40. For a sense of French autonomy as arising from comparison with Italy, see Lionello Sozzi, "La polémique anti-italien en France au XVI^{e} siècle," *Atti della Accademia delle Scienzie di Torino* 106 (1972): 99–190.

43. See Navarrete, *Orphans of Petrarch,* pp. 126–90.

44. Quotations from Garcilaso de la Vega, *Obras completas,* ed. Elias Rivers (Madrid: Castalia, 1981).

45. For the logic of knowing the national self through knowing others, see Benedict Anderson, *The Spectre of Comparisons* (London: Verso, 1998), pp. 41–45.

46. For economic figurations implicit in this idea of enriching the language, building cultural capital, and selling poetry, see Philippe Desan, *L'imaginaire économique de la Renaissance* (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions Inter-Universitaires, 1993), pp. 85–116.

47. For polemics about the *Deffence,* see Kees Meerhoff, *Rhétorique et poétique au XVI siècle en France: Du Bellay, Ramus, et les autres* (Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1986), pp. 49–172.

48. Text in *Traités de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance,* ed. Francis Goyet (Paris: Livre de Poche Classique, 1990), pp. 187–236, quoted from p. 198.

49. For such discussions, see Erica Rummel, *The Humanist Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 29–35; and Jill Kraye, "Philologists and Philosophers," *Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism,* ed. Jill Krey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 142–60.

50. For the reception of Horace in Du Bellay's time, see Ann Moss, "Horace in the Sixteenth-Century: Commentators into Critics," in *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism,* vol. 3: *The Renaissance,* ed. Glyn Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 66–76; and Raymond Lebègue, "Horace en France pendant la Renaissance," *Humanisme et Renaissance* 3 (1936): 141–64, 289–308, and 384–419. For Du Bellay's ideas on Latin imitation, see Marc Bizer, *La poésie au miroir: Imitation et conscience de soi dans la poésie latine de la Pléiade* (Paris: Champion, 1995), pp. 50–58. For Du Bellay's acute sense of linguistic difference, see Greene, *Light in Troy,* pp. 189–96.

51. In Cicero's *De oratore* Crassus advocates this method for training orators: "The result of [translating] was that in rendering into Latin what I had read in Greek, I not only found myself using the best words—and yet quite familiar ones—but also, coining by analogy certain words such as would be new to our people," *De oratore,* trans. E. W. Sutton and T. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1942), 1.34.155, p. 107. Cicero had translated whole texts by Aratus, Aeschines, and Demosthenes and passages from Plato, Homer, and the Greek dramatists in his various treatises. Horace in his *ars poetica* (Epistle to the Pisos, 2.3) promises a fair outcome "nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres; nec desilies imitator in artum" 'if you do not seek to render word for word as a slavish translator, and if in your copying you do not leap into the narrow well' (*Epistle,* 2.3 pp. 133–34, in *Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica,* ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926]). Horace had sought to project a metrical voice similar to Pindar's in his imitation of Greek Alcaics, Sapphics, and Asclepiadeans and thus to vie with Virgil in alternative genres for the voice of the empire's poet.

52. For Dolet's Ciceronian response to Horatian precept, see Glyn Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva: Droz, 1984), pp. 185–214.

53. Speroni's Bembo comes to modify the historical Bembo's celebrated position about Petrarch and Boccaccio as models for Italian style. Speroni's interlocutor admits that the contemporary vernacular, especially as spoken and written in elite circles of the courts and academies, ought to supplement these models. In his metaphor language grows like a tree "la quale non ha a pieno fiorito, non che i frutti prodotti, che ella può fare" 'that has hardly bloomed, much less borne the fruit of which it is capable' (p. 96/183). See Ignacio Navarrete, "Strategies of Appropriation in Speroni's *Dialogo* and Du Bellay's *Deffence,*" *Comparative Literature* 41 (1989): 141–54. For Speroni's dialogual form, see Jon Snyder, *Writing the Scene of Speaking: Theories of Dialogue in the Late Italian Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), pp. 87–133. For a representative passage from Speroni's dialogue on rhetoric, see Wayne A. Rebhorn, trans., *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), pp. 111–27. For sixteenth-century convictions about language as arbitrary and conventional rather than natural, enabling Du Bellay to impute equal value to all languages, see Marie-Luce Demonet, *Les voix du signe: Nature et origine du langage à la Renaissance* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1992), pp. 390–93 and 455–57.

54. For Horatian techniques of self-presentation and multiple address in changing circumstances, see Gregson Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); and Randall L. B. McNeill, *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 89–130.

55. The line is quoted on the title page of *Olive* and the *Vers lyriques* and again

after the final poem in the *Vers lyriques,* the epigram to Marot. For comment, see Dorothy Gabe Coleman, *The Chaste Muse* (Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1980), pp. 32–36.

56. For comment, see Henri Weber, *La création poétique au XVI^e siècle en France,* 2 vols. (Paris: Nizet, 1956), p. 234.

57. Text of Peletier's *Art poétique* in Francis Goyet, ed., *Traités,* pp. 237–346: "L'Oeuvre Héroïque est celui qui donne le prix, et le vrai titre de Poëte" (p. 305).

58. Although Petrarch disavowed the idea, as noted earlier, *translatio studii* is an old legend in France. See Beaune, *Birth of an Ideology,* pp. 275–82. At the end of the first century St. Denis brought to Paris not only Christianity but also the learning of Greco-Roman antiquity. At the beginning of the ninth century Charlemagne had Alcuin bring more ancient learning to France. Since the twelfth century the University of Paris housed not just the philosophy, law, and rhetoric of the ancients but also the theology of Christendom. Chrétien de Troyes proposed that "pre-eminence in chivalry and learning once belonged to Greece" but has now passed to France; see the prologue to *Cligés,* ll. 31–44, Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances,* trans. W. W. Comfort (New York: Dutton, 1914), p. 91.

59. Volker Hoffmann, "Donec totum impleat orbem: Symbolisme impérial au temps de Henri II," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Française* 1978 (1980): 20–42. The imperial ambitions of the Valois to resume the inheritance of Charlemagne extended from François I's 1519 candidacy for the Imperial throne (which spurred Charles V's revenge at Pavia) to Henri II's plan to rule Metz, Toul, and Verdun as "Imperial Vicar." See Zeller, *Aspects de la politique française,* pp. 55–66.

60. For historical discussions, see Le Roy Ladurie, *Royal French State,* pp. 124–50; David Potter, *A History of France, 1460–1560* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 19–31; and Frederic J. Baumgartner, *France in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 135–50; see also Kelley, *Foundations,* pp. 151–82; and Salmon, *Society in Crisis,* pp. 79–91.

61. For Jean du Bellay's politics between 1549 and 1560, see Dickson, *Du Bellay in Rome,* pp. 107–54. Joachim Du Bellay's Gallican and evangelical sympathies appear consonant with those of his uncle. They are politically pragmatic and doctrinally progressive but firmly opposed to the rigid theology of Calvinism, even as the Gallican Church appeared headed for schism from Rome. In matters of belief the poet inclined to some reformist positions on the workings of divine grace, but he disdained radical reform that emphasized human depravity, and he despised the hypocrisy of Calvin and his Geneva circle. Sonnet 136 of *Les Regrets,* "Je les ai vus, Bizet, et si bien m'en souvient" 'I saw them, Bizet, and so well I remember it,' for example, takes sharp aim at Calvin's intolerance and the bigotry of his followers. In matters of relationship between church and state Joachim Du Bellay clearly aligned himself with the Gallican cause. See Gilbert Gadoffre, *Du Bellay et le sacré* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978), pp. 182–208.

62. For the rhetorical import of this figure, see Rebhorn, *Emperor,* pp. 66–79.

63. See Marie-Madeleine de La Garanderie, *Christianisme et letters profanes*

(1515–1535): Essai sur les mentalités des milieux intellectuels parisiens et sur les pensées de Guillaume Budé, 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1976), 1.45–50 and 2.110–15; and Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 275–98. For the relationship between examples and practical advice, see Hampton, *Writing from History,* pp. 31–41.

64. Lucian of Samosata, *Works,* ed. and trans. A. M. Harmon et al., 8 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913–67), 1. 65.

65. The myth of the Gallic Hercules has a complicated evolution. In the *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitéz de Troye* (1511–13) Jean Lemaire de Belges had told the story of the great Hercules of Libya, tenth king of Gaul. Drawing upon the hero's adventures in Annius of Viterbo's *Commentaria super Opera Diversorum Auctorum* (1498), which in turn depended upon Diodorus Siculus's biography of Hercules, Lemaire related the hero's exploits in Spain and France. While passing through France, this Hercules fathered Galathes, who gave his name to Gaul as ancestor of all its people. Hercules thus figures as progenitor of the French royal family, the mythic head of a ruling dynasty that traces its descent through Gallic history. Contaminations of Lucian's account became famous in France through Geoffroy Tory's translation of the *Prolakia* in *Champfleury* (1529) and through its inclusion in Andrea Alciati's *Emblemata* (1531/46). See Stephens, *Giants in Those Days,* pp. 158 ff., 410 ff. For transformations in the identity of France as personified by figures from Celtic and Germanic myth which supplement those from Greco-Roman myth, see Godoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 299–341.

66. See Marie-Rose Logan, ed. and trans., "The Poetics of Persuasion: Guillaume Budé's Commentary on the *Digest,* XI.3.13," *Annals of Scholarship* 6 (1989): 26. For Budé's achievement, see Marie-Rose Logan, "Writing the Self: Guillaume Budé's Poetics of Scholarship," in *Contending Kingdoms,* ed. M.-R. Logan and Peter Rudnytsky (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991), pp. 131–48.

Five Totems for Defense

1. For the emergence of a cultured nobility and bourgeoisie at such centers, see Jouanna, *La France du XVI^e siècle,* pp. 105–24 and 267–82; Jean-Marie Constant, *La société française aux XVI e XVII siècles* (Gap: Ophrys, 1994), pp. 17–34; and Robert Harding, *Anatomy of a Power Elite* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978); see also Schalk, *From Valor to Pedigree,* pp. 37–58 and 174–204; Motley, *Becoming a French Aristocrat,* pp. 123–58; Neuschel, *Word of Honor,* pp. 186–207; for aristocratic doubts about the moral underpinnings of its society as noble writers contemplate social change and cultural contradiction after 1570, generating modern ideas about the self, see Jonathan Dewald, *Aristocratic Experience and the Origins of Modern Culture in France, 1570–1715* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 69–103; for the aristocracy in the Bourbon monarchy, see Roland Mousnier, *The Institutions of France under the Absolute Monarchy,* trans. Brian Pierce, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 1.113–213.

2. Baumgartner, *Henry II,* pp. 42–63; for Du Bellay's polemical misrepresentation of contemporary literary history, see Donald Stone Jr., *Mellin de Saint-Gelais and Literary History* (Lexington, Ky.: French Forum, 1983), pp. 11–19.

3. The French case ending in *changent* permits either reading, but the subjunctive mood of the analogous *tengano* in Petrarch's text implies that Du Bellay's verb is subjunctive.

4. For the ideological and artistic opposition of Guillaume and Jean with attention to the former's open-minded contamination of lyric and romance which generates its own need for revision and continuation, see David Hult, *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Readership and Authority in the First "Roman de la Rose"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), esp. pp. 10–63.

5. For Machaut's pivotal role in fusing the courtly "I" with new concepts of composition including the making of the codex and the business of patronage, see Kevin Brownlee, *Poetic Identity in Guillaume de Machaut* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), esp. pp. 94–123. For conditions of performance in earlier Troubadour poetry which encouraged efforts to fix texts and control circulation, see Amelia Van Vleck, *Memory and Re-Creation in Troubadour Lyric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 71–132. For the evolution of a first-person poetry from generalizing abstraction of the troubadours to the narrative theatricality of later periods, see Michel Zink, *The Invention of Literary Subjectivity,* trans. David Sices (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), pp. 37–69.

6. For poetry associated with *la grande rhétorique,* see Paul Zumthor, *Le masque et la lumière: Poétique des grands rhétoriqueurs* (Paris: Seuil, 1978); and François Rigolot, *Le texte de la Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 1982), pp. 23–121. For associating the second rhetoric with verbal music, or *rithmique,* see Warner Forrest Patterson, *Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory: A Critical History of the Chief Arts of Poetry in France, 1328–1630,* 2 vols. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935), 1.143–206 and 1.241–88.

7. For the movement from a performative oral poetics to a writerly textual poetics evidenced in the *Roman*'s careful planning and reception as a book, see Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyrics and Lyrical Narrative Poetry* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 11–15 and 83–105. For reworkings of the text by Gui de Mori, who accepted differences between Guillaume and Jean and added his own voice as a third author, and by an anonymous "B *remanier,*" who aims to harmonize Jean's voice with Guillaume's, see Sylvia Huot, *The "Romance of the Rose" and Its Medieval Readers: Reception, Interpretation, Manuscript Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), esp. pp. 85–161.

8. Texts in Eric Hicks, *Le débat sur le "Roman de la rose"* (Paris: Champion, 1977), pp. 49–178, with translations by Joseph L. Baird and John R. Kane, *La Querelle de la Rose: Letters and Documents* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), pp. 35–168. For the development from a *Querelle de Rose* into a

Querelle des femmes as grounded in humanist pedagogical training rather than in gender polemics, and especially as a promotional event in the history of publishing, see Floyd Gray, *Gender, Rhetoric, and Print Culture in French Renaissance Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 6–29.

9. Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la rose,* ed. Félix Lecoy, 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1966–68).

10. Quoted from Molinet's preface in *Romant de la rose moralisié cler et net* (1529; rpt., Geneva: Slatkine, 1972), bii^{r} (originally published in Paris, 1500; rpt., Lyon, 1503 and Paris 1521). For Molinet's allegorical scheme, see Rosmund Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp. 237–46. For its date of composition based on references to Philippe de Clève's unmarried status in 1482, see Francis William Bourdillon, *The Early Editions of the Roman de la Rose* (London: Chiswick, 1906), pp. 147, 160–62; others argue for a date closer to its publication in 1500; see Noel Dupire, *Jean Molinet: La vie, les oeuvres* (Paris: Droz, 1932), pp. 71–101; and Jean Devaux, *Jean Molinet, Indiciare bourguignon* (Paris: Champion, 1996), pp. 177–88, 250–53, 395–97, 607. For the tendency of Molinet's flamboyant style to complicate rather than clarify the allegorical resemblance between carnal and spiritual love, see Michael Randall, *Building Resemblances: Analogical Imagery in the Early French Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 13–39.

11. Quoted in Bernard Weinberg, ed., *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1950), p. 60. Marot subsequently iterates his public purposes as a sort of cultural mission, "Pour laquelle chose restituer en meilleur estat et plus expediente forme pour l'intelligence des lecteurs et auditeurs" 'To restore it to a better condition and more useful form for the comprehension of readers and listeners' (Weinberg, ed., p. 61). For discussion about the extent to which the revision is Marot's, see Philipp August Becker, "Clément Marot und der Rosenroman," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift* 4 (1912): 684–87; and Bernard Weinberg, "Guillaume Michel, dit de Tours, the Editor of the 1516 *Roman de la Rose,*" *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 9 (1949): 72–85. For Marot's approval of allegorizing the Rose as a figure for Divine Sapience or Grace or the Virgin Mary, see Huot, *"Romance of the Rose" and Its Readers,* pp. 335–36.

12. For various clienteles in the Parisian book trade, see Nancy Vickers, "The Unauthored 1539 Volume in Which Is Printed the *Hecatomphile,*" in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture,* ed. Margreta de Grazia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 166–88. For subsequent changes in production and distribution during the Wars of Religion, see Henri-Jean Martin, *The French Book: Religion, Absolutism, and Readership, 1585–1715,* trans. Paul Saenger and Nadine Saenger (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 1–29.

13. See Stephen Nichols Jr., "Marot, Villon, and the *Roman de la Rose:* A Study in the Language of Creation and Recreation," *Studies in Philology* 63 (1966): 135–43, and 64 (1967): 25–43.

14. For Marot one might consider the additional influence of cartographic writing that inscribes new relations of individuals to space and to an emerging sense of national identity; see Tom Conley, *The Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), pp. 1–23.

15. *Les Oevvres de Françoys Villon de Paris,* in Weinberg, *Critical Prefaces,* pp. 65–68. For comparisons of inconsistencies between Marot's revisions of the *Rose* and of Villon, see Pauline M. Smith, *Clément Marot, Poet of the French Renaissance* (London: Athlone, 1970); and C. A. Meyer, *Clément Marot* (Paris: Nizet, 1972), pp. 474–77. For an "aesthetics of return" implied in such revisions, with pleasure found in vicissitudes of recognition, see Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology,* trans. Betsy Wing (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), pp. 33–45.

16. According to Defaux, *Oeuvres poétiques,* 2.361, the poem was composed in March 1538–February 1540 and was followed in Roffet's edition of Salel by an epigram of Mellin de Saint-Gelais. It was republished as number 28 in Marot's *Quatrième livre des epigrammes,* printed at Poitiers in 1547 by the brothers Jean et Enguibert de Marnef.

17. See Peter Rickard, *La langue française au seizième siècle: Etude suivie de textes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 119–22.

18. See Zumthor, *Le masque et la lumière,* pp. 39–55, for their social origins, implying their "carrierères incertaines, tourmentes" under fickle patrons (p. 47), and pp. 108–18, for an emphasis on the diversity of their practices. For dependence upon patronage affecting creative powers in representing political concerns and for the gradual emergence of strong authorial voices, especially Jean Marot and Jean Lemaire, see Cynthia Jane Brown, *Shaping of History and Poetry in Late Medieval France: Propaganda and Artistic Expression in the Works of the Rhétoriqueurs* (Birmingham, Ala.: Summa Publications, 1985), esp. pp. 147–62; for the decline in royal patronage as generating an intensified authorial self-consciousness and reshaping propagandistic modes into self-advertisement, see Cynthia Jane Brown, *Poets, Patrons, and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 197–246.

19. Huges Salel, *Oeuvres poétiques completes,* ed. Howard H. Kalwoes (Geneva: Droz, 1987), pp. ix.

20. Alain Chartier and Jean Marot mapped a route that others followed. Born at Bayeux around 1385 but educated at the University of Paris, Chartier entered the service of the dauphin (later Charles VII) at Bourges in 1418. He became *chanoine* (canon) of Paris in 1420 and the dauphin's secretary in 1422. As poet and chronicleer of the Hundred Years War, he fostered national sentiment and resistance against England. See his pamphlet *Quadrilogue invectif* (1422), ed. E. Droz (Paris: Champion, 1923). For Chartier's poetry, see *Poetical Works,* ed. J. C. Laidlaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), with biographical and critical study on pp. 1–42. Jean Marot proved typical of this group in his social origins and

service to the Crown. Born around 1460 at Caen and employed at various noble households for his rhetorical skills, he became secretary in 1506 to Anne of Brittany, widow of Charles VIII and wife of Louis XII; he later served Louis and his successor François I as propagandist for their Italian expeditions, providing entree for his son into the highest court society. Thus he celebrates Louis in *La Blason de foy* as "le treschrestien roy, / Loys, XII^{e}, en triumphant au roy faulsée." See *Les deux recueils Jehan Marot de Caen,* ed. Gérard Defaux and Thierry Mantovani (Geneva: Droz, 1999), pp. 155–63 and 401–16, quoted from p. 160.

21. In truth they never considered themselves as members of a school, nor did they ever refer to themselves as "rhétoriqueurs," a term that the nineteenth-century editor Charles d'Héricault took from Guillaume Coquillart's *Droit nouveaux* (1481), in which it refers to the sophistic skills of bureaucratic ministers of justice; d'Hericault subsequently used it to describe Coquillart's "école littéraire bourgeoise" characterized by "les curieuses tournures, les gestes bizarres, les postures grotesques, les habits extravagans," in *Les oeuvres poétiques de Guillaume Coquillart,* ed. Charles d'Héricault, 2 vols. (Paris: P. Jannet, 1857), 1.xii. For the rhetoric of "équivoque" as a serious attempt to repair the breakdown (*fracture*) of language through craftsmanship (*facture*) of poetry, see François Cornilliat *"Or ne mens": Couleurs de l'eloge et du blâme chez les 'grands rhétoriqueurs'* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1994), pp. 31–36; for the arbitrary nature of the sign implied in the biblical story of Babel and affirmed by Aristotle as dominating sixteenth-century linguistic thought, see Demonet, *Les voix du signe*, pp. 390–93. For the importance of expressive layouts and displayed rhyme that highlight formal features in early printed editions, see Adrian Armstrong, *Technique and Technology: Script, Print, and Poetics in France, 1470–1550* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 55–90 and 121–56.

22. Jean Meschinot (1420?–91), son of a petit seigneur from Brittany, became maitre d'hôtel for Anne of Brittany. Echoing the terminal gasps of feudal opposition to a centralized monarchy, he wrote *Les Lunettes des princes* (1461–64) as a spokesman for the miserable populace against Louis XI's efforts to control and subdue the opposing nobility. See Christine Martineau-Genieys, *Les Lunettes des princes de Jean Meschinot* (Geneva: Droz, 1972), with biographical and critical study on pp. ix–cxxxvi. See in this macaronic text the poetic dialogue between Louis XI and a personified France; formerly attributed to Charles d'Orléans, it is assigned to Meschinot by Paul Zumthor:

> —Or dy.—Je suy . . .—Qui?—La destruicte France.
> —Par qui?—Par vous.—Comment?—En tous estats.
> —Tu mens!—Non fay.—Qui le dit?—Ma souffrance.
> (Zumthor ed., 40)

Octovien de Saint-Gelays (1468?–1502), a lesser nobleman from Cognac, served at the courts of Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII, where he produced translations of Virgil and Ovid and other occasional poetry, including a panegyric for the House of Valois entitled *Le séjour d'Honneur* (1489–93). In 1495 Octovien took holy

orders to receive the bishopric of Angoulême. See Henri Joseph Molinier, *Essai biographique et littéraire sur Octavien de Saint-Gelays* (1910; rpt., Geneva: Slatkine, 1972). For Octovien's efforts as one of the first published authors to secure privilege for publication, see Elizabeth Armstrong, *Before Copyright: The French Book Privilege System, 1498–1526* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 182–87.

23. Originating outside noble circles of the Ile-de-France were Georges Chastellain, Jean Molinet, and Jean Lemaire de Belges. Each came from cities in Hainault and served dukes of Burgundy, but, whether by anticipation or by subsequent reconstruction, each facilitated Burgundy's absorption into France upon the death of Charles the Bold in 1477. Georges Chastellain (1405?–75), born at Alost, served Philip the Fair of Burgundy (d. 1467) and Charles the Bold (1467 ff.) as *indiciaire,* or official chronicler, of the House of Burgundy, reinforcing its connections with the Valois monarchy of France. See Georges Chastellain, *Oeuvres,* ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, 8 vols. (Brussels: Heussner, 1863–66). Jean Molinet (1435–1507), born at Boulogne-sur-Mer, succeeded Chastellain as *indiciaire* and upon Charles the Bold's death served the latter's daughter Marie and her husband, Maximilian of Austria, urging them toward union with France; his *Art de rhétorique vulgaire* codified some of the Rhétoriqueurs' major tenets about the separation of poetry from song and the beguilements of verse rhythm. Consider the ringing exhortation in *Le naufrage de la pucelle,* written upon Charles' death in 1477:

> Gentilz enfans, joindés vous avec France. . . .
> Obéissiés à vostre roy;
> Gens trébuchiés, temporissiés.
> Recognoissiés le franc terroy
> Dont vous issiés, recognoissiés.
> (Zumthor, ed., 77)

Compare in *L'arbre de Bourgogne* (1486) the Francophile version of the demise of the House of Burgundy, "Qui, non content de son propre héritaige, / Gaigna la mort par soy trop loing estendre" (Zumthor, ed., 85; FD 234). See Noel Dupire, *Jean Molinet: La vie, les oeuvres* (Paris: Droz, 1932); and Jean Devaux, *Jean Molinet: Indiciaire bourguignon* (Paris: Champion, 1996), pp. 171–358. See also the *Chronique,* ed. Georges Doutrepont and Omer Jodogne, 3 vols. (Brussels: L'Académie Royale de Belgique, 1935–37). Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473–1548?), born at Bavay, was Molinet's godson and succeeded him as *indiciaire* for Marguerite d'Autriche, the daughter of Marie and Maximilian; his immense compilation of fact, fiction, myth, and legend about France, the *Illustrations de Gaule at singularités de Troye* (1511–13), earned him an appointment at the court of Louis XII in 1513, though he evidently fell out of favor with François I after 1515. See J. Stécher, ed., *Oeuvres de Jean Lemaire de Belges,* 4 vols. (1882–85; rpt., Geneva: Slatkine, 1969), 4.i–xciii; and Pierre Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges, écrivain franco-bourguignon* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1972). An important factor in Louis XII's recognition of Jean Lemaire was the latter's commendation of the French language and its

literature as superior to modern Tuscan and ancient Latin products in *La Concorde des deuz langaiges* (1511): "Vostre hauteur de ce l'esjouira / Dedens brief temps: car j'en voy les apprestz, / Dont un chacun vostre nom bénira" (Zumthor, ed., 169). For Chastellain's and Lemaire's efforts to secure privilege for publication, see Elizabeth Armstrong, *Before Copyright,* pp. 182–87.

24. Other members of Marot's pantheon served the church in various capacities. Arnoul Gréban (ca. 1420–71) became choirmaster of Notre Dame in Paris and with his brother Simon wrote and produced mystery plays. Guillaume Coquillart (1421–1510), the archepiscopal bursar of Reims, wrote spiritual and satiric verse. Guillaume Cretin (1461?–1525), cantor of Saint Chapelle, composed various patriotic poems including an unfinished versified *Chronique françoise* and a *Ballade contre le Pape Julius II* (1511). For Arnoul Gréban, see *Le Mystère de la Passion* (Angers, 1486), ed. Omer Jodigne (Gembloux: Duculot, 1959). For Guillaume Coquillart, see *Oeuvres suivies d'oeuvres attribuées à l'auteur,* ed. M. J. Freeman (Geneva: Droz, 1975). For Cretin, see Kathleen Chesney, *Oeuvres poétiques de Guillaume Cretin* (Paris: Slatkine Reprint, 1977).

25. The map of France as Du Bellay knew it came into shape only after these poets' services to the Crown. The Orléanais of Jean de Meun, for example, did not pass to the Crown until 1498, nor did the Brittany of Jean Meschinot pass to the Crown until 1491. The Hainault of Molinet, Lemaire, and Chastellain, part of the feudal domain controlled by the duke of Burgundy until 1477, belonged to the House of Hapsburg in Du Bellay's time.

26. For the concern of such new classes with the honorific privileges, public precedence, and polite salutation that accompanied their rise in status, see Jouanna, *L'idée de race,* pp. 203–52 and 515–66; Schalk *From Valor to Pedigree,* pp. 174–212; Harding, *Anatomy of a Power Elite* pp. 99–117; and Davis Bitton, *French Nobility in Crisis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), pp. 94–117.

27. For Marot's involvement in Evangelism and efforts to establish a recognizable and indelible style for voice as a mirror of the soul echoing Divine logos, see Gérard Defaux, *Marot, Rabelais, Montaigne: L'écriture comme présence* (Paris: Champion-Slatkine, 1987), pp. 57–98; and Michael Screech, *Marot évangélique* (Geneva: Droz, 1967). Marot's most notable contribution to the reformist movement was his translation of fifty Psalms (Geneva, 1543, completed by Théodore de Bèze in 1562), now available in a facsimile edition, Clément Marot and Théodore de Bèze, *Les Psaulmes en vers français avec leurs melodies*, ed. Pierre Pidoux (Geneva: Droz, 1986), with critical introduction on pp. 1–38.

28. For Marot's relationship to Virgil, see C. A. Meyer, *Clément Marot* (Paris: Nizet, 1972), pp. 200–210; Pierre Jourda, *Marot* (Paris: Hatier, 1967), pp. 50–63; Smith, *Clément Marot;* and Robert Griffin, *Clément Marot and the Inflections of Poetic Voice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), pp. 159–224.

29. For Du Bellay's attitude toward Marot at the time of sending the first *Olive* to press, see Chamard, *Histoire,* 1.285; and Marc Whitney, "Du Bellay in April, 1549: Continuum and Change," *French Review* 44 (1971): 352–61.

30. See Marot's "Epistre à Madame de Soubize, partant de Ferrare pour s'en venir en France," with its nod to "Jan Le Maire Belgeois, / Qui l'ame avoit d'Homere le Gregeois" (ll. 39–40).

31. Pierre Jodogne grounds the poem's composition in 1511 (published 1513) when Louis XI sought an alliance with Florence against the papacy; for Lemaire's antipathy to Petrarch's amatory sentiment and his preferences for Jean de Meun's religious, moral, and historical orientation, see Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges, Ecrivain Franco-bourguignon* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1971), pp. 443–61. For the loyalty of Lemaire, Gringoire, and Jean Marot to royal policy, see Cynthia Brown, *Shaping History and Poetry,* pp. 37–145.

32. See the superb psychoanalytic and paraphonic study of Petrarchism as a site of transcultural anxiety in Alan K. Smith, "Scopia: Visual and Oral Fantasies of Self-Invention in *La Concorde des deux langaiges,*" in *Repossessions: Psychoanalysis and the Phantasms of Early Modern Culture,* ed. Alan K. Smith and Timothy Murray (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), pp. 111–41. For Lemaire's writerly investment in his work, see Adrian Armstrong, *Technique and Technology,* pp. 104–11.

33. Quoted from *La Concorde des deuz langaiges,* ed. Jean Frappier (Paris: Droz, 1947). For the circumstances of its composition, see Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges,* pp. 444–48; Donald Stone, "Some Observations on the Text and Possible Meanings of *La Concorde,*" *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance* 55 (1993): 65–76; and Jacques Abélard, "*Les Illustrations de Gaule* de Jean Lemaire de Belges: Quelle Gaule? Quelle Nation?" *Nouvelle Revue du Sezième Siècle* 13 (1995): 7–28.

34. For the Rhétoriqueurs' relatively anonymous forms of rhymed verse and their gradual displacement by first-person forms typical of classical elegies, epigrams, and epistles, see Gray, *Gender, Rhetoric, and Print Culture,* pp. 62–76.

35. For the Rhétoriqueurs' manipulations of visual form to convey their own sense of self-identity, see Conley, *Self-Made Map,* pp. 62–87. For their increasing use of self-promotional strategies in appending dedicatory prefaces, see Brown, *Poets, Patrons, and Printers,* pp. 153–96.

36. Clément Marot's father, Jean Marot, for example, had shaped poems in the form of rebuses in which the design of words on the page figures their meaning in relation to space and sight. The typographical layout in the following lines, for example, suppresses the prepositions *sur, sous,* and *entre* so that, where they should function in compound forms, the root or affix appears above, below, or within the phrase:

De l'honneur	=	De(ssus) l'honneur	=	on (top of) the honor

And:

il pr, avoit, is	=	il avois (entre)pris	=	he ta, had, ken (under)
	=	he had undertaken		

(Zumthor, *Anthologie,* p. 224)

For the Rhétoriqueurs' self-conscious techniques reflecting their creative investment in textual production and their position as writers, see Adrian Armstrong, *Technique and Technology,* with attention to Molinet on pp. 17–90 and Lemaire on pp. 91–156.

37. For Marot's purifying of genres, see Defaux's introduction to Marot, *Oeuvres poétiques.* For patterns of graphic opening and circular closure which nonetheless impinge upon poetic, structural, and historical meanings in Marot, see Tom Conley, *The Graphic Unconscious in Early Modern French Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 17–29; and "A Late Spending of *Rhétorique:* Reading Marot 'Par Contradictions,'" *Esprit Créateur* 18 (1978): 82–91.

38. For the Rhétoriqueurs' repersonalizing of the lyric in direct contravention to the depersonalized conventions of genre according to the Second Rhetoric, see Rigolot, *Le texte de la Renaissance,* pp. 61–103.

39. In 1494 Charles VIII had brought from Italy to France a dozen manuscripts of the *Trionfi* and commissioned George de la Farge and Simon Bourgouyn to translate them; Robertet based his poem upon these manuscripts; see Simone, *French Renaissance,* pp. 141–222. Its six nine-line stanzas convey the flavor of Petrarch's text, as in its rendering of the Triumph of Death:

> Combien que l'omme soit chaste et tout pudicque
> Les seurs fatalles par leur loy auctentique
> Tranchent les nerfz et filletz de la vie;
> A ce le Mort tous les vivans convie.
>
> However chaste and modest a person might be, the fatal sisters by their inexorable law cut the spirit and the threads of life. To this, Death invites all living persons. (Qtd. in *Les six Triumphes de Petrarque,* in *Les oeuvres de Jean Robertet,* ed. C. M. Zsuppan [Geneva: Droz, 1970], p. 75)

For a similar exercise by Jean's son François designed to be incorporated into tapestry representations of the Petrarchan Triumphs, see C. A. Mayer and D. Bentley-Cranch, "François Robertet: French Sixteenth-Century Civil Servant, Poet, and Artist," *Renaissance Studies* 11 (1997): 208–22.

40. Quoted from *Le Parnasse satirique,* in Zumthor, *Anthologie,* p. 104.

41. Epistre XXVI, ll. 35–36, in 2.154, Defaux, ed.

42. Epigram LXII in 2.233, Defaux, ed., written before 1538, first published by Dolet in 1541.

43. Maurice Scève staged his "discovery" at Avignon to attract the king's attention while the latter was at nearby Marseilles to welcome to France the arrival of Catherine de'Medici as bride of the future Henri II. The event was is honored by several Petrarchan poems in *Les Fleurs de poésie* (ed. François Brodeau, 1534); see Defaux "Des poèmes oublis de Clément Marot: Le 'Prince des poètes françoys' et *Les Fleurs de Poésie* de 1534," *Travaux de la littérature,* 5:37–67. For uses of Petrar-

chan figuration at the courts of Louis XII and François I, see Anne-Marie Lecoq, *François I imaginaire* (Paris: Macula, 1987), pp. 26–34.

44. See, for example, the Petrarchan contrarieties in his rondeau "Par contradictions," folded in with his absorption of a *Rhétoriqueur*-like equivocal rhyme of *desespere* and *tresprospere,* the assonance and consonance of *tourmentant* and *contentant,* and the internal phonic play of *esperant, espoir,* and *desespere:*

> En esperant, Espoir me desespere,
> Tant que la mort m'est vie tresprospere,
> Me tourmentant de ce, qui me contente,
> [Me contenant de ce, qui me tourmente,]
> Pour la douleur de soulas que j'espere.
> Amour hayneuse en aigreur me tempere:
> Puis temperance aspre comme Vipere,
> Me refroidist soubz chaleur vehemente,
> En esperant.
>
> Hope makes me despair in hoping; so that death constitutes a very kind life for me, tormenting me with what contents me, contenting me with what torments me for the suffering of the joy that I hope. Full of hatred, Love tempers me in sourness; then temperance, sharp as a viper, chills me with a violent heat while I hope.

For Marot's sense of Petrarch mediated by the fifteenth-century Petrarchism of Carteo, Serafino, and others, see Mia Cocco, *Tradizione cortese e il petrarchismo nella poesia di Clément Marot* (Florence: Olschki, 1978), esp. pp. 205–18; see also C. A. Meyer and D. Bentley-Cranch, "Clément Marot, poète pétrarquiste," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 28 (1966): 32–51; and Meyer, *Clément Marot,* pp. 54–60.

45. For Marot's evangelism, see Defaux, *Marot, Rabelais, Monatigne,* pp. 57–98.

46. Dates are offered by Defaux in his edition (2.495). Marot's direct translations from Petrarch follow their originals with admirable closeness, though their sestets incorporate a distinctive rhyme scheme—perhaps derived from Saint-Gelais—beginning with a couplet *ccdeed* which Marot had devised for his sonnet honoring Renée of France. See Cocco, *Tradizione,* p. 141. Weber speculates that Marot translated Petrarch as early as 1536, *Création,* p. 239. For Marot's careful choice of representative sonnets, see Sara Sturm-Maddox, *Ronsard, Petrarch, and the "Amours"* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999), p. 29.

47. Both of these published sonnets reflect his passage through Lyon in 1536–37 en route to Fontainebleau from Italy. One sonnet, published in his *Oeuvres* of 1538 and designated as epigram 27, celebrates the governor of Lyon, Pomponio Trivulce, by comparing him to a planet or star that astrologically guides human conduct: "Au ciel n'y a ne planette ne signe" 'There is neither planet nor star

in the heavens.' Marot's second Lyonnais sonnet, published in his *Oeuvres* of 1542 as epigram 73, deals with a literary topic. It addresses two young men who have praised Marot's poetry: "Adolescens qui la peine avez prise / De m'enrichir de loz non merité" 'Young men who have made an effort to endow me with unmerited praise.' The speaker suggests that they should instead direct their commendation to someone else, cryptically named "Louise": "Laissez moy là, et louez moy Loyse" 'Leave me aside and praise Louise for me.' Meyer suggests that the woman might be Louise Labé: "C'est le doulx feu dont ma Muse est esprise" 'She is the sweet fire with whom my muse is captivated.' In 1536, while in Italy, he addressed a sonnet to his protector, Renée of France, wife of Ercole d'Este, duke of Ferrara. Renée's power comes from her lineage, rooted in her genealogy and etymologically inscribed in the words *race* and *racine:* "O cueur sans fiel, o race d'excellence" 'O heart without malice, o race of excellence.' Published posthumously in 1550, it appears now in his *Oeuvres* as epigram 35. Yet another of Marot's sonnets, not discovered until 1898, was surely unknown to Du Bellay. It sketches a comparison between François I and Charles V, all to the latter's detriment.

48. Marot entered her service in 1519. Throughout the 1520s Marguerite encouraged patriotic reform-minded work by Erasmians such as Lefevre d'Etaples, Bishop Briçonnet, and Gérard Roussel, and in 1531 she gave assylum to Jean Calvin. See Pierre Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre,* 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1930); André Winandy, "Piety and Humanistic Symbolism in the Works of Marguerite," *Yale French Studies* 47 (1972): 145–69; and Robert D. Cottrell, *The Grammar of Silence: A Reading of Marguerite de Navarre's Poetry* (Wadhington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986), pp. 3–35.

49. For revisions of national and political aims as a result of the Calvinists' increasing antiroyalism, see Nancy L. Roelker, *One King, One Faith: The Parlement of Paris and the Religious Reformations of the Sixteenth-Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), pp. 59–94, for Parlement's conservative constitutional limitations on the king's power; Dale Van Kely, *The Religious Origins of the French Revolution: From Calvinism to the Civil Constitution, 1560–1791* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 15–30; Le Roy Ladurie, *Royal French State,* pp. 281–88; Robert Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555–1563* (Geneva: Droz, 1956), pp. 3–32; Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought,* vol. 2: *The Age of Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 254–67; and Kelley, *Beginning of Ideology,* pp. 169–211. In the long run, of course, Calvin's theory bent under the weight of its prior claim that Divine Providence determines every outcome. According to this logic, no system of human government, however strong or weak, wise or foolish, just or unjust, could be anything but fallible. It might function only as an instrument of God's will.

50. Scripture provides a model in the magistracy of the twelve judges of ancient Israel, instituted "by the authority of the Lord himself" (*Institutes* 4.20;

2.657). For political implications in the administration of provincial France, where Calvinism had some impact, see Le Roy Ladurie, *French Peasantry,* pp. 231–66.

51. See, for example, the nationalist tenor of Petrarchan figurations in *The Entry of Henry II into Paris, 16 June 1549,* ed. I. D. McFarlane (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1982), pp. 28–35 and 61–75.

52. In the spirit of this ode the volume also presents original epigrams, odes, chansons, blazons, and epitaphs, including ones addressed to Ronsard and Mellin de Saint-Gelais. See Marcel Françon's introduction and appendices to *Les oeuvres poétiques de Jacques Peletier du Mans,* photo reproduction of Paris: Gilles Corrozet, 1547, ed. Françon (Rochecorbon, Indre et Loire: Charles Gay, 1958), pp. 93–95 and 318–45.

53. See the editors' introduction to the translation of Petrarch by Vasquin Philieul, *Laure d'Avignon, extraict du Poète florentin (1548),* ed. Pierre Lartigue and Jacques Roubaud (Paris: Actes Sud-Papiers, 1987). Philieul was born at Carpentras, the town where Petrarch had been raised as a child.

54. Quotations from Lartigue and Roubaud, *Lavre d'Avignon.*

55. For the crisis between France and the papacy which reached its height in 1551, see Kelley, *Foundations,* pp. 151–82. For the later emergence within France of political divisions based on theological differences, see Ann W. Ramsey, *Liturgy, Politics, and Salvation: The Catholic League in Paris and the Nature of Catholic Reform* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1999), pp. 7–43.

Six Illustrations of Taboo

1. For Du Bellay's deliberate positioning of poems about art at the center of the sequence, see Richard A. Katz, *The Ordered Text: The Sonnet Sequences of Du Bellay* (New York: Peter Lang, 1985), pp. 30–33; for sonnet 62 as a meditation on Olive's excellence, see JoAnn DellaNeva, "Illustrating the *Deffence:* Imitation and Perfection in Du Bellay's *Olive,*" *French Review* 61 (1987): 39–49; for Du Bellay's emphasis on art and craft over inspiration and furor, see Edwin M. Duval, "Wresting Petrarch's Laurels: Scève, Du Bellay, and the Invention of the *Canzoniere,*" *Annals of Scholarship* 16 (2003).

2. For identifications, see the detailed notes in Ernesta Caldarini, *Olive.*

3. The first volume, edited by Lodovico Domenichi and printed at the press of Gabriel Giolito in Venice, appeared in 1545 with the title *Rime Diverse di molti eccellentissimi Autori nvovamente raccolte;* it opens with a selection of sixteen sonnets and one canzone by Pietro Bembo as models for those that follow. The second volume, edited by Giolito himself, appeared in 1548 and follows a similar format. Other volumes adopting Giolito's format but not always published by him include volume 3, edited by Andrea Arrivabene and printed by Bartolomeo Casano at Venice in 1550; volume 4, edited by Ercole Bottrigari and printed at Bologna by Anselm Giaccarello in 1551; volume 5 (actually the sixth volume in order of publi-

cation), edited by Lodovico Dolce and printed by Giolito at Venice in 1555; volume 6 (actually the fifth volume in order of publication), edited by Arrivabene with a discourse by Girolamo Ruscelli, printed by Degno del Pozzo at Venice in 1553; volume 7, explicitly focused on Neapolitan poets, *Rime di diversi signori napolletani, e d'altri,* edited by Ludovico Dolce and printed by Giolito at Venice in 1556; and volume 9 (actually the eighth volume; there is no volume 8 formally designated as such), edited and printed by Vincenzo Conti at Cremona in 1560. See Louise George Clubb and William G. Clubb, "Building a Lyric Canon: Gabriel Giolito and the Rival Anthologists, 1545–1560," *Italica* 68 (1991): 332–44; and JoAnn DellaNeva, "Variations in a Minor Key: Du Bellay's Imitations of the Giolito Anthology Poets," *French Forum* 14 (1989): 133–46. A volume devoted to women's poetry, titled *Rime diverse d'alcune nobilissime et virtuosissime donne,* appeared at Venice in 1559. For other anthologies devoted to women's poetry, see Amedeo Quondam, *Petrarchismo mediato: Per una critica della forma antologia* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974), pp. 133–53.

4. The Treaty of Crépy (September 1544) signaled a high point in Charles V's hold over northern Italy even as it nominally addressed Charles's French and German problem. Throughout the 1530s Charles tried to secure the German nobility's allegiance to the Hapsburgs, a goal that he could reach only by undoing Lutheran sympathies that had fused German princes in such blocs as the Schmalkaldic League. After the abortive Diet of Regensburg in 1541, Charles resolved to use force. To prevent François I from aiding the Protestants, he attacked France in 1542. At Crépy he agreed to generous terms that would neutralize France by ceding Milan as a dowry to the duc d'Orléans. By awarding Parma and Piacenza to the pope's nephew in May 1545, he later pressured Pope Paul III to call a general council at Trent in order to end the theological conflict. See Lynch, *Spain, 1516–1598,* pp. 95–137.

5. See, for example, the sonnet in praise of Rome as a patriotic center by Baldassare Castiglione, "Superbi colli, e voi sacre ruine" (2.48).

6. For Diego's extraordinary career as imperial ambassador and papal legate, see Erika Spivakovsky, *Son of the Alhambra: Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, 1504–1575* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1970), pp. 97–155. Diego was a friend of Boscán, and he wrote a volume of poetry published posthumously at Madrid in 1610; he is also a contender for the authorship of *Lazarillo de Tormes,* published in 1553; see Spivakovsky, *Son of the Alhambra,* pp. 318–32.

7. A good example is a sonnet by Giulio Camillo Delminio which exemplifies the volume's iconoclasm. The poem celebrates Gian Matteo Giberti (1495–1543), the papal datary of Pope Clement VII:

Tu, che secondo l'alta Roma honora;
Sol coglier puoi per quelle riue ombrose
Le piu fresche uiole, & dilettose
Nate ad un parto con la bella Aurora.

> You, whom high Rome honors as second in esteem, alone can gather on these shady banks the freshest and most delightful violets delivered in their birth with beautiful Dawn.

A brilliant humanist and a no less astute politician, Giberti formulated a policy of resistance to Charles V's Italian plans which the papacy failed to heed. Demoralized after the Sack of Rome in 1527, he left the papal court and attended to spiritual reform in his bishopric of Verona, hospitable to progressive religious views that Charles and later Pope Paul III despised. See Adriano Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e controriforma: G. M. Giberti* (Rome: Liguori, 1969); and Peter Partner, *Renaissance Rome: 1500–1559* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), pp. 29–33 and 212.

8. For Du Bellay's ambiguous attitude, see V. L. Saulnier, *Du Bellay, l'homme et l'oeuvre* (Paris: Boivin, 1951), pp. 47–48.

9. For the native genius of the French vernacular used by Marot and before him by the Rhétoriqueurs and late Medièval poets to effect a bond among social orders, a bond undone by Du Bellay's anxiety about the distance between ancient and modern, see Marc Fumaroli, "The Genius of the French Language", in *Realms of Memory*, ed. Nora, 3. 555–606, especially pp. 558–79.

10. Peter Rickard, *A History of the French Language* (London: Routledge, 1989), pp. 82–83. For the role of rhetoric and poetics in canonizing this standard, see Mireille Huchon, *Français de la Renaissance* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1988), pp. 49–63.

11. For the confluence of economic and cultural influences in defining a national identity, see John McGovern, "The Rise of New Economic Attitudes: Economic Humanism, Economic Nationalism during the Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance," *Traditio* 26 (1970): 217–53. For the urban culture of Paris and other regional centers, see Muchembled, *Popular Culture and Elite Culture,* pp. 111–78; and Huppert, *Style of Paris,* pp. 1–36.

12. Rickard, *History,* pp. 38–46; and Henriette Walter, *French Inside Out,* trans. Peter Fawcett (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 54–58. For Rabelais's contemporaneous representation of vernacular dialects as destroying Christendom's unity even while they created new forms of national community, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 82–85 and 99–108.

13. See Walther von Wartburg, *Evolution et structure de la langue française* (Berne: Franke, 1962), pp. 120–22. For artificial interventions by humanists to force the development of the language, see Michel Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from da Vinci to Montaigne,* trans. Nidra Poller (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 175–93.

14. For Meigret and Du Bellay, see Yves Citton and André Wyss, *Les doctrines orthographiques du XVI^e^ siècle en France* (Geneva: Droz: 1989), pp. 85–116; Nina Catach, *L'orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 1968), pp. 161–68; Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française,* vol. 3: *Le seizième siè-*

cle (Paris: Armand Colin, 1906), 2.95–114, 139–45; and Rickard, *History,* pp. 94–95. For Palsgrave, see Sven Gösta Neumann, *Recherches sur le français des XV^e^ et XVI^e^ siècles* (Lund: Gleerup, 1959), pp. 18–70. Other orthographical reforms came from Thomas Sebillet (*L'art poetique françoeze,* 1548), Pierre de Ronsard, Jacques Peletier du Mans (*Dialogue de l'ortografe,* 1550), Pierre de Rammé (Petrus Ramus) (*Grammère,* 1562), and Jean Antoine de Baif (*Entrénes de poézie fransoeze,* 1572). At the opposite extreme Guillaume des Autels initiated a movement to change pronunciation so as to match normative spelling.

15. B. L. Ullman, *Ancient Writing and Its Influence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), pp. 118–59. For example, to *feue,* which could be understood as either *feue* (fire) or *feve* (fever), scribes added an etymological *b* (corresponding to the *b* of Latin *faba*) to compose *febve* (fever). See Walter, *French Inside Out,* pp. 182–86.

16. It sustained seven different languages and a host of dialects and patois: three largely non-Romance languages at the northern frontiers with Germanic, Dutch, and Flemish elements; Gallo-Celtic Breton in the west; and non-Indo-European Basque in the southwest. In the center of France the two major *oc* and *oil* forms of French subdivided into Provençal, Languedocien, Gascon, Bearais, Limousin, and Auvergnat in the south and Normand, Picard, Bourguignon, Bourbonnais, Champenois, Berrichon, Orléanais, Tourangeau, Angevin, and Francien in the north, with the dialects of Poitou and Saintonge on the border between north and south.

17. For the variety of dialects in sixteenth-century French and for the role of the Protestant Reformation in stabilizing their number, see Marie-Madeleine Fragonard and Eliane Kotler, *Introduction à la langue du XVI^e^ siècle* (Paris: Nathan, 1994), pp. 10–14 and 22–25. In 1565 Ronsard and in 1579 Henri Estienne compared French dialects favorably to Italian ones on the grounds that French speakers freely mix and conjoin their variant forms in order to understand one another, whereas Italian speakers do not; see Brunot, *Histoire,* pp. 175–76.

18. Rickard, *La langue française,* p. 81. For Tory's effort to map the French language upon a national and historically founded space that charts new relations between the subject and the world, see Conley, *Self-Made Map,* pp. 62–87.

19. Brunot, *Histoire,* 2.174–76.

20. Preface "au Lecteur" to his translation of "L'art poétique d'Horace" (1544) in Rickard, *La langue française,* p. 119. For sixteenth-century debates on orthography and syntax, see Catach, *L'orthographie,* pp. 242–62; Huchon, *Le français de la Renaissance,* pp. 64–89; and Fragonard and Kotler, *Introduction,* pp. 47–62. For contested theories of language as natural (based on Plato's *Cratylus*) or conventional (based on the biblical myth of Babel, reinforced by St. Augustine and Scholasticism) within which Du Bellay situates his idea of language as a product of *fantasie* (*Deffence* 1.1) and arbitrary convention (1.10), see Demonet, esp. pp. 390–93 and 455–57.

21. For Héroët's lineage and education, see the biography by Colletet in *Oeuvres poétiques,* ed. Ferdinand Gohin, Société des Textes Françises Modernes (Paris: Cornély, 1909), pp. vii–xliv.

22. Composed and circulated in manuscripts at court in 1536, collected, published, and republished in a single volume edited by Jean de Tournes at Lyon in 1541 and 1547, *Opuscules d'Amour, par Heroet, la Borderie, et autres divins poetes.* Quotations from Ferdinand Gohin, ed.

23. See James V. Mirollo, *Mannerism and Renaissance Poetry: Concept, Mode, Inner Design* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), pp. 72–98; and Elizabeth Cropper, "On Beautiful Women: Parmigianino, Petrarchismo, and the Vernacular Style," *Art Bulletin* 58 (1976): 374–94. For Cellini's poetry, see Margaret Galluci, "A New Look at Benuvenuto Cellini's Poetry," *Forum Italicum* 34 (2000): 343–71. But, for the intellectual sophistication of Fontainebleau as evidenced by its library and other cultural trappings, see Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 229–50, esp. pp. 243–46.

24. Quotations from *Opere toscane di Lvigi Alamanni al Christianissimo rè Francesco Primo,* 2 vols. (Lyon: Sebastian Gryphius, 1532–33), in which the sonnets appear in vol. 1, pp. 188–287, and vol. 2, pp. 259–92.

25. Benvenuto Cellini, invited to Fontainebleau a decade later but with no tolerance for Petrarchan gravity, describes how Alamanni set the tone for his poetry with his sheer physical elegance "since he was very handsome, had a well-proportioned body, and spoke with a charming voice," in *The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini,* trans. George Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956), p. 239. For Cellini's aversion to Petrarch and endorsement of Dante, see Galluci, "New Look"; Bruno Maier, "Le rime di Benvenuto Cellini," *Annali Triestini* 22 (1952): 307–58; and Deborah Parker, *Bronzino's Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 109–10. For the largesse of François I who was pleased by Alamanni's translation of one of his sonnets into Italian and for possible influences of Alamanni's classicism on early Pléiade theory, see Henri Hauvette, *Un exilé florentin à la cour de France au XVI*e *siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1903), pp. 97–107, 442–60.

26. These lines in the *Recueil* follow upon Du Bellay's praise for the mellifluous qualities of Saint-Gelais's verse in a series of Marotic puns on his name: "Mellin, tes vers emmiels / Qui aussi doulx que ton nom coulent, / Au nectar des Muses meslez / L'honneur de tous les autres foulent" 'Mellin, your honeyed verses which flow as sweetly as your name, mixed with the nectar of the muses, crush the honor of all others' (ode 3.53–56).

27. For Saint-Gelais's experiments in the epigram as leading toward stanzaic verse without repeated rhymes and toward a disparagement of medieval fixed forms, see Donald Stone Jr., *Saint-Gelais and Literary History,* pp. 21–59. For Marot's experiments with French epigram, see Mayer, *Marot,* pp. 412–16; and Gérard Defaux's introduction to his edition, 2: xxi–xxiv. For Du Bellay's defense of the sonnet form as superior to the epigram based upon evaluations of their respective topical matters, see François Rigolot, "Le sonnet et l'epigramme, ou: L'enjeu de la 'superscription,'" in *Pre-Pléiade Poetry,* ed. Jerry Nash (Lexington Ky.: French Forum, 1985), pp. 97–111.

28. See Mellin de Saint-Gelais, *Oeuvres poétiques françaises,* ed. Donald Stone

Jr., 2 vols. (Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1993), pp. ix–xxvii; of the twenty-two extant sonnets, Stone dates twelve between 1544–56, of which seven were published before 1553, including one in *La fleur* (#21) and one in the *Oeuvres* of 1547 (#3): 173–205. Quotations from Stone, ed.

29. C. A. Mayer, "Le premier sonnet français," *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire Française* 67 (1967): 481–93.

30. Mellin de Saint-Gelais, *Sonnets,* ed. Luigia Zilli (Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. xiii–xvii and 1–3.

31. For Scève's relationship to Petrarch, see Joann DellaNeva, *Song and Countersong: Scève's "Délie";* and Petrarch's Rime (Lexington, Ky.: French Forum, 1983); Deborah Lesko Baker, *Narcissus and the Lover: Mythic Recovery and Reinvention in Scève's "Délie"* (Saratoga, Calif.: Anma, 1986); and Jerry C. Nash, *The Love Aesthetics of Maurice Scève: Poetry and Struggle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

32. See Timothy Hampton, "Criticism in the City: Lyons and Paris," in *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism,* ed. Glyn Norton, vol. 3: *The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 348–54. For the social impact of commerce on the hierarchy of elites, see Richard Gascon, *Grand commerce et vie urbaine au XVI^e siècle: Lyon et ses marchands (environs de 1520–1580),* 2 vols. (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), 1.351–434; Jacqueline Boucher, *Présence italienne à Lyon à la Renaissance* (Lyon: LUGD, 1994), pp. 99–167; and Roger Doucet, "Le XVI^e siècle à Lyon," in *Histoire de Lyon,* ed. Arthur Jean Kleinclausz, 3 vols. (Lyon: Pierre Masson, 1939–48), 1.357–81.

33. The "discovery" was not really a discovery. In a note in his edition of Virgil, Petrarch cites Laura's burial place in the charterhouse of the Brothers' Minor at Avignon. *Bucolicum Carmen* figures this site ("Ille locus tua damna tegit" 'That place shelters your loss'), and Benvenuto da Imola's fourteenth-century commentary identifies it "hac parte . . . fratruum minorum" 'in this plot of the Brothers' Minor.' See Antonio Avena, *Il Bucolicum carmen e i suoi commenti* (Padua: Società Cooperativa Tipografica, 1906), pp. 240–41. The first published account of Scève's discovery occurs in Jean de Tournes's preface to his edition of Petrarch's *Rime sparse* published at Lyon in 1547 on the eve of Henri II's coronation and of Scève's preparations for the spectacle of the king's entry into the city. See Verdun L. Saulnier, *Maurice Scève,* 2 vols. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1948), 1.38–48; and Olivier Millet, "Le tombeau de la morte et la voix du poète: La mémoire de Pétrarque en France autour de 1533," in *Regards sur la poésie dans l'Europe des XVI^e–XVII^e siècles* (Bern: Lang, 1997), pp. 45–72.

34. See, for example, dizains 53–55, 252, 389, and 437.

35. See Thomas M. Greene, "Styles of Experience in Scève's *Délie,*" *Yale French Studies* 47 (1972): 57–75; and William J. Kennedy, "The Unbound Turns of Maurice Scève," in *Creative Imitation,* ed. David Quint (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992), pp. 67–88.

36. For the publication of *Délie,* see Chamard *Histoire* 1.149 and 4.191. For

echoes from the *Roman de la rose,* see dizains 37, 59, 172, 251, and 368. For echoes from Lemaire, see dizain 247. The preponderance of Scève's echoes are Italian: from Petrarch, of course, and from Dante (dizain 241), Sannazaro (dizain 48), Serafino (dizains 98 and 397), Cariteo (dizains 26 and 199), Bembo (dizains 18 and 241), Vittoria Colonna (dizains 135 and 412), and Sperone Speroni (dizains 428–46).

37. The rhyme of 426 dizains in *Délie* repeats this scheme, and Du Bellay in turn uses it in his epigram to Marot printed at the end of the *Vers lyriques.*

38. See Doranne Fenoaltea, "Scève's *Délie* and Marot: A Study of Intertextualities," in *Pre-Pléiade Poetry,* ed. Jerry Nash (Lexington, Ky.: French Forum, 1985), pp. 136–47; and François Rigolot, "L'intertexte Scèvien: Pétrarque et Marot," *CAIEF* 32 (1980): 91–106.

39. See JoAnn DellaNeva, "Du Bellay: Reader of Scève, Reader of Petrarch," *Romanic Review* 79 (1988): 401–12.

40. See, for example, "L'obscure nuyt de ma triste pensée" 'The obscure night of my sad thought' (*Olive* 12), echoing "Fuyant la nuict de ma pensée obscure" 'fleeing the night of my dark thought' (*Délie* 266); "J'abisme au fond de l'eternelle nuit" 'I sink to the bottom of eternal night' (*Olive* 81), evoking "Je m'appercoy la memoire abismée" 'I feel my memory engulfed' (*Délie* 165); and "Ainsi la nuit tes baisers favorise" 'This night favors your kisses' (*Olive* 104), evoking "Comme la lune aux amants favorise" 'As the moon is favorable to lovers' (*Délie* 394). Other echoes inhabit *O* 28 > *D* 144, *O* 51 > *D* 77, *O* 35 > D 119, *O* 11 > D 158, *O* 27 > *D* 368, *O* 28 > *D* 223, *O* 100 > *D* 92. For Du Bellay's cordial relationship with Scève at Lyons in 1553–57, see Enzo Giudici, "Du Bellay et l'*é*cole lyonnaise," *Esprit Créateur* 19 (1979): 66–73; and Josiane Rieu, *L'esthétique de Du Bellay* (Paris: SEDES, 1995), pp. 57–59.

41. For efforts similar to Du Bellay's by other French writers appreciative of Italian achievements but rivalrously seeking to overgo them, see Jean Balsamo, *Les rencontres des muses: Italianisme et anti-italiansime dans les lettres françaises de la fin du XVI*e *siècle* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1992), pp. 29–34 and 137–51. For the dialectical relationship of various voices and lyric forms to Du Bellay's anxiety about his liminal position between France and Italy, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 150–94.

42. See Floyd Gray, *La poétique de Du Bellay* (Paris: Nizet, 1978), pp. 12–27, for an intertextuality that refuses blind passion, a "poétique d'anonymat" that dominates instead of surrendering to furor. For Du Bellay's fascination with writing in a difficult style in *Olive,* see Saulnier, *Du Bellay,* pp. 140–42.

43. For its calendrical structure compared with that of Spenser's *Amoretti,* see Anne Lake Prescott, "Spenser (Re)Reading du Bellay: Chronology and Literary Response," in *Spenser's Life and the Subject of Biography,* ed. Judith H. Anderson, Donald Cheney, and David Richardson (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), pp. 131–45, esp. pp. 39–42.

44. I quote from Veronica Gambara, *Le rime,* ed. Alan Bullock (Florence: Olschki, 1995), pp. 157–58. For Gambara's cultural and political relationship to the

reformist movement in Italy, see Antonia Chimenti, *Veronica Gambara, gentildonna del rinascimento: Un intreccio di poesia e storia* (Reggio Emilia: Magis, 1995), pp. 34–98; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 134–46.

45. Leo Spitzer's masterly analysis, "The Poetic Treatment of a Platonic-Christian Theme," *Comparative Literature* 6 (1954): 193–217, shows how its rhythmic organization inscribes a net of correspondences around the soul's ascent toward the Platonic Idea, while its anaphorical repetitions condense a host of scriptural and philosophical topoi. Roman Jakobson's contrasting analysis in *Questions de la poétique* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973), pp. 319–55, shows how its syntactic subtleties sharpen the polarity of otherworldly and terrestrial oppositions. For the preteritional turn that enables one to say what has conditionally been termed inexpressible, see Philip E. Lewis, *Turns of Mind: Seeing through the Mother Goose Tales* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 78–122.

46. See the lines from Héroët's *L'androgyne;* and Saint-Gelais's sonnet 3, p. xxxxx.

47. Du Bellay visited him at Lyon in May 1553 and October 1557; see *Les Regrets* 155. Tyard took holy orders and in 1554 became canon of the cathedral of Mâcon, where he devoted himself to study and publication. In 1574 he was named *aumônier* of Henri III and in 1578 bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône. See Silvio Baridon, *Pontus de Tyard (1521–1605)* (Milan: Viscontea, 1950), pp. 14–15 and 69.

48. For dates of their respective publications, see Chamard, *Histoire,* 1.241–50, 2.124–30, and 3.144–62.

49. In his preface to the edition of 1573 Tyard refers to "le fil de ceste longue continuation commencée il ya trente ans" 'the thread of this longue continuation begun thirty years ago' (p. 89), implying its inception in 1543. The volume's dedicatory sonnet to Maurice Scève assures the latter that "tu y pourras recongnoitre la flame" 'here you will be able to recognize the flame of love.'

50. See Eva Kushner, "Le système symbolique dans la poétique de Pontus de Tyard," *Saggi e Ricerche della Letteratura Francese* 12 (1973): 9–45. For comparisons between Du Bellay and Tyard, see Robert V. Merrill, *The Platonism of Joachim Du Bellay* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), pp. 112–18 and 146–50.

51. For Tyard's poetic "errance" as a topos that replaces Petrarch's moral errancy, see Jean-Claude Carron, *Discours de l'errance amoureuse* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1986), pp. 16–27 and 87–111. For Du Bellay's adaption of Platonic love to Christian concepts of heavenly love with Augustinian overtones, see Gadoffre, *Du Bellay et le sacré,* pp. 37–43 and 245–65.

52. For reciprocal influences of *Olive* and the *Erreurs* on each other and of the *Erreurs* on *Sonnets d'honneste amour,* see Baridon, *Pontus de Tyard,* pp. 14–24 and 54–64. For Neoplatonic influences on both poets, see Robert V. Merrill and Robert J. Clements, *Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry* (New York: New York University Press, 1957), pp. 59–68.

53. See George Hugo Tucker, *The Poet's Odyssey* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 54–87; and Guy Demerson, "Le *Songe* de Joachim Du Bellay et les sens

des recueils romains," in *Le Songe à la Renaissance,* ed. Françoise Charpentier (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 1990), pp. 169–78. Demerson relates *Les Antiquitez de Rome* and *Songe* to *Les Regrets* as the prelude to an extended Petrarchan sequence that embraces all these sequences in depicting the ruins of ancient Rome (*Les Antiquites de Rome*), the depravities of the Holy Roman Empire (*Songe*), and lost ideals in modern Italy and France (*Les Regrets*).

54. See Ellen Zetzel Lambert, *Placing Sorrow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1976), pp. 107–24, for the adaptation of the classical elegy into French by Marot, Scève, and Ronsard.

55. See Wayne Rebhorn, "Du Bellay's Imperial Mistress: *Les Antiquitez de Rome* as Petrarchist Sonnet Sequence," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980): 609–22; for Rome as a female figuration threatening impotence, see Margaret Ferguson, "The Afflatus of Ruin," *Roman Images: Selected Papers of the English Institute,* ed. Annabel Patterson (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), pp. 23–50.

56. For Charles's imperial trappings, see Anthony Pagden, pp. 40–44 and 104–7.

57. See Julia Conway Bondanella, *Petrarch's Visions and Their Renaissance Analogues* (Madrid: José Porrùa Turanzas, 1978). For Du Bellay's retrospective use of the myth of chaos to figure contemporary events in a universal perspective here and in *Les Antiquitez,* see Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion,* pp. 88–96.

58. For a reading of *Songe* as a sequence of sonnets narrating this history with a Gallican critique of dangers attendant upon it, see Gadoffre, *Du Bellay et le sacré,* pp. 170–82. For Du Bellay's courage in the face of ethical shabbiness and the pillaging of antiquity around him, see Greene, *Light in Troy,* pp. 220–41.

59. See Charles Béné, "Des visions de Pétrarque au *Songe* de Du Bellay," *Recherches et Travaux de l'Université de Grenoble* 5 (1972): 17–27; for a reading of *Songe* as a formal puzzle, see Michael Riffaterre, "Le tissu du texte: Du Bellay's *Songe,*" *Poétique* 10 (1978): 3–22; for its preoccupation with religion, satire, and personal statement which later poets would develop, see Yvonne Bellenger, *La Pléiade* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1978), pp. 70–74.

Seven Mon semblable, mon frère

1. For Du Bellay's expression of triumph over adversity in writing poetry as opposed to Ronsard's facility, see Gray, *La poétique de Du Bellay,* pp. 79–86 and 161–69; and Weber, *Création,* pp. 249–62, 391–98, and 438–44. For comparisons of Du Bellay's later poetry with Ronsard's, see Josiane Rieu, *L'esthétique de Du Bellay* (Paris: SEDES, 1995), pp. 120–27; and Tucker, *Poet's Odyssey,* pp. 21–39. For Ronsard's early adversarial relationship with Du Bellay based on a comparison of Ronsard's imitations of Ariosto with those by Du Bellay, see JoAnn DellaNeva, "Teaching Du Bellay a Lesson: Ronsard's Rewriting of Ariosto's Sonnets," *French Forum* 24 (1999): 285–301. For their poetic rivalry as registered in *Les Regrets,* see Marc Bizer, *Les lettres romaines de Du Bellay* (Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2001), pp. 154–68.

2. Chamard, *Du Bellay,* pp. 234–48. See the preface to the *Recueil de Poésie* (5 November 1549) with its sense of gloom about his prospects for support and intimations of a family crisis that would be worsened by the death of his brother René the following year and legal battles that it initiated with the latter's heirs.

3. For a fine analysis of this opening poem, see Sara Sturm-Maddox, *Ronsard, Petrarch, and the "Amours"* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999), pp. 36–45.

4. For Ronsard's similarities with and differences from Du Bellay concerning the creation of a national poetic language, see Isidore Silver, *The Intellectual Evolution of Ronsard, II: Ronsard's General Theory of Poetry* (St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1973), pp. 26–62.

5. Lines 5–8; quotation from *Poemata*, ed. Geneviève Demerson, vol. 6 of Joachim Du Bellay, *Oeuvres*, gen. ed. Henri Chamard, Société de Textes Littéraires Français (Paris: Nizet, 1984); translation in Nichols, ed. *Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry.* For Du Bellay's artistry in Latin verse, see Bizer, *Poésie au miroir,* pp. 61–107.

6. For Ronsard's fantasies of escape from Petrarch, see Greene, *Light in Troy,* pp. 197–219. For the impression in Ronsard's early poetry of errant verbal anagrams breaking the symmetries of fixed forms with dispersive energies, see Conley, *Graphic Unconscious,* pp. 73–115.

7. For the alleged preeminence of France in music, see Larner, *Culture and Society in Italy,* pp. 168–77; and Howard Mayer Brown, *Music in the Renaissance* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), pp. 93–184; and Leeman L. Perkins, *Music in the Age of the Renaissance* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999), pp. 270–94 and 618–32.

8. Quotations from Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes,* ed. Paul Laumonier, 20 vols., 4th ed. (Paris: Nizet-Didier, 1973–75), 1.72–73. Besides poems addressed to Du Bellay in *Odes* 1.11, 1.18, 3.14, 3.15, and 4.7, the volume addresses poems about technical poetic skill to such poets as Jacques Bouju (1.10), Jean Dorat (1.11), Jean Antoine de Baif (1.12), Jean Martin (1.13), Guillaume Des Autels (2.17), Denys Lambin (3.7), and Maclou de la Haie (3.17).

9. Laumonier, ed., 1.111. For Ronsard's oral performance of his *Odes* at Fontainebleau, where he subsequently incurred the enmity of his rivals, see Gadoffre, *La révolution culturelle,* pp. 245–46.

10. Laumonier, ed., 1.83.

11. Laumonier, ed., 5.167. This poem first appeared in *Les Amours* (1553) and was incorporated into *Les Odes* 4.25 in 1560.

12. Quotations from Weber, ed.

13. Laumonier, ed., 1.118.

14. Laumonier, ed., 2.38.

15. For Ronsard's pursuit of high patronage and poetic enrichment, see Desan, *L'Imaginaire économique,* pp. 117–49. For schemes of imbrication in the *Odes* which suggest Ronsard's effort to fashion a cultural program fulfilling Du Bellay's *Deffence,* see Doranne Fenoaltea, *Du palais au jardin: L'architecture des Odes de Ronsard* (Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. 31–60.

16. For the topos of the ship of state in Petrarch's sonnet 189 and its later imitations, see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 220–35.

17. Ronsard's subsequent *Continuation du discours* (also 1562) likewise attacks Calvinist arrogance and pride, while his *Remonstrance* and *Response aux injures* (both 1563) defend Catholic orthodoxy; see Francis Higman, "Ronsard's Political and Polemical Poetry," in *Ronsard the Poet,* ed. Terence Cave (London: Methuen, 1973), pp. 241–85. Ronsard's earlier *Exhortation au camp du roy pour bien combatre* and his *Exhortation pour paix* (1558), anticipating the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, express conventional Erasmian sentiments about peace; see James Hutton, *Essays on Renaissance Poetry,* ed. Rita Guerlac (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 291–310. Du Bellay's contributions to these genres shortly before his death were his prose *Ample discours au roy sur le faict des quatre estats de royaume de France* and his Latin poem *Xenia.*

18. "Appeal to the Ruling Class," in Luther, *Selections,* p. 429.

19. For the complicated differences between Gallican evangelical movement, which supported moderate reform, and the Ultramontane Papist faction, which urged unqualified adherence to Rome, and between both these groups and the radical reform of Luther or Calvin, see Salmon, *Crisis,* pp. 79–89; and Baumgartner, *France in the Sixteenth Century,* pp. 135–50. For Du Bellay's Gallicanism and evangelism in opposition to Calvinism and ultramontane Catholicism, see Gadoffre, *Du Bellay et le sacré,* pp. 196–208.

20. See Baumgarten, *Henry II,* pp. 203–17; Knecht, *Francis I,* pp. 55–63; Potter, *History of France,* pp. 225–31 and 276–77; Le Roy Ladurie, *Royal French State,* pp. 124–49.

21. For Ronsard's movement from academic classicism to civic humanism and finally, through the pressures of religious dispute, to courtly culture, see Daniel Ménager, *Ronsard: Le roy, le poète, et les hommes* (Geneva: Droz, 1979), pp. 129–85. For his pursuit of princely favor as an extreme version of condign dependence earlier expressed by Marot, see Ulrich Langer, *Divine and Poetic Freedom in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 65–71.

22. Cf., for example, Aurora's lament for Memnon in Ovid's *Metamorphoses:* "ille color, quo matutina rubescunt tempora" 'those bright hues by which morning skies flush rosy red' (13.581).

23. For Ronsard's profound faith in cosmic energy strengthened by his intuition of Ovidian flux and evidenced in his representation of labyrinthine dances throughout his oeuvre, see Thomas M. Greene, "Labyrinthine Dances in the French and English Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 1403–66, esp. pp. 1422–44.

24. Marc-Antoine de Muret, *Commentaires au premiere livre des Amours de Ronsard,* ed. Jacques Chomaret, Marie-Madeleine Fragonard, and Giselle Mathieu-Castellani (Geneva: Droz, 1985), p. 57. The poem is sonnet 106 in the 1587 edition of Ronsard's *Oeuvres,* "Me souvenant du nom" [sonnet 101 in *Les Amours*]; the other poem that Muret cites is sonnet 189 in the 1587 edition, "Du bord d'Espagne" [sonnet 189 of *Les Amours*]. For Ronsard's interest in the mutable forms

implied in these poems, see Kathleen Anne Perry [Long], *Another Reality: Metamorphosis and the Imagination in the Poetry of Ovid, Petrarch, and Ronsard* (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), pp. 133–66; for metonymic confusions of gender which push mutability to the limits of androgyny, see Lawrence D. Kritzman, *The Rhetoric of Sexuality and the Literature of the French Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 113–29.

25. For a detailed study of this doctrine and its relationship with mania and melancholy, see Olivier Pot, *Inspiration et mélancholie: L'épistémologie poétique dans "Les Amours" de Ronsard* (Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. 17–42 and 188–219. For Ronsard's fascination with the transformative energies of a flexible Greco-Roman world as opposed to the regimented universe of a Judeo-Christian world, see Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion,* pp. 34–42.

26. The date of his work on "Contre les Petrarquistes" is uncertain, but it was published as poem 20 of *Divers jeux rustiques* (17 January, 1558).

27. For Du Bellay's protestation against hypocritical friendships at court, see Pauline M. Smith, *The Anti-Courtier Trend in Sixteenth-Century French Literature* (Geneva: Droz, 1966), pp. 107–23. For his preoccupation with the economic order in the uncertain domain of patronage intimated in sonnet 152 of *Les Regrets,* see Timothy Hampton, "'Trafiquer la louange': L'économie de la poésie dans *Les Regrets,*" in *Du Bellay et ses sonnets romains,* ed. Yvonne Bellinger (Paris: Champion, 1994), pp. 47–60. For his rejection of genres apt to please his patrons, see Cathleen M. Bauschatz, "Du Bellay's Changing Attitude toward Reading from the *Deffence* to the *Regrets,*" *L'Esprit Créateur* 19 (1979): 21–37.

28. For epistolary conventions that in *Les Regrets* shape Du Bellay's criticism of court and his statement of a new poetics in relation to Ronsard's practice, see Marc Bizer, "Letters from Home: The Epistolary Aspects of Joachim Du Bellay's *Les Regrets,*" *Renaissance Quarterly* 52 (1999): 40–79; and Bizer, *Les lettres romaines,* pp. 17–58. For a statistical study of Du Bellay's lyrical subjectivity and literary intertextuality as expressed both in his epistolary prose and in mixed forms of satire, elegy, and eulogy in *Les Regrets*, see Françoise Argod-Dutard, *L'écriture de Joachim Du Bellay* (Geneva: Droz, 2002), pp. 141–73, with transcriptions of letters on pp. 409–81.

29. Cardinal du Bellay actively assisted the treaty between France and Spain negotiated at Vaucelles. Carlo Carafa, nephew of Pope Paul IV, a Neapolitan who was determined to provoke France into driving the Spanish from southern Italy, enlisted the Guise faction to prevent du Bellay from ending the strife. Their maneuvers resulted in the cardinal's fall from power. For the political context of *Les Regrets,* see François Roudaut, *Joachim Du Bellay: Les Regrets* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1995), pp. 25–32; Gadoffre, *Du Bellay et le sacré,* pp. 245–65; and Baumgartner, *Henry II,* pp. 171–74.

30. Dedication 99–100. Quotations from *Les Regrets* refer to Michael Screech, ed., with translations (occasionally modified) from *The Regrets,* trans. C. H. Sisson (Manchester: Carcanet, 1984).

31. For Du Bellay's dialogue with Ronsard in *Les Regrets* as an effort to estab-

lish the autonomy of his own poetry, see Gray, *La poétique de Du Bellay,* pp. 79–95; and Eric Macphail, *The Voyage to Rome in French Renaissance Literature* (Saratoga, Calif.: ANMA Libri, 1990), pp. 53–65.

32. Subtle borrowings from Marot inform *Les Regrets.* The rhyme of sonnet 9 ("France mere des arts") recalls Marot's *Eglogue au roy souz les noms de Pan et Robin* ("Las, tes autres aigneaux n'ont faute de pasture, / Ils ne craignent le loup, le vent, ny la froidure": "Qui conservas de ses prez la verdure, / Et qui gardas son troupeau de froidure"). In sonnet 31 the homey figuration of chimney smoke ("Quand revoiray-je helas, de mon petit village / Fumer la cheminee") echoes Marot's *Epistre à la Royne de Navarre,* "veu de loingson village fumer." See the detailed notes in Aris and Joukovsky, *Oeuvres poétiques.*

33. For Du Bellay's contamination of the Petrarchan sonnet form with the epigrammatic voice of the satirist, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 169–81.

34. Quotations from Demerson, *Poemata;* translations from Nichols, *Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry.*

35. For Du Bellay's turn to Latin as an effort to escape the shadow of Ronsard's French poetry, see Geneviève Demerson, "Les obsessions linguistiques de Joachim Du Bellay," in *Troisième congrès international d'études néo-latines,* ed. Jean Claude Margolin, 2 vols. (Paris: Vrin, 1980), 2.513–27.

36. For the shift from real geography to allegorical or emblematic space dramatizing the plight of the court poet removed from the cultural economy in which he defines himself, see Hampton, *Literature and Nation,* pp. 150–94.

37. For Du Bellay's inclination toward satire in these poems, see Philippe Desan, "De la poésie de circonstance à la satire: Du Bellay et l'engagement poétique," in *Actes du Colloque International d'Angers du 26 au 29 mai 1989,* ed. Georges Cesbron (Angers: Presse de l'Université, 1990), pp. 399–420. For his satiric use of the epistolary mode to suggest a profound mistrust of national stereotypes, see Bizer, *Les lettres romaines de Du Bellay,* pp. 83–91, and Argod-Dutard, *L'écritrere de Joachim Du Bellay*, pp. 247–78.

38. For a parallel critique of Petrarchism in "Le poète courtisan" as an expression of his freedom to establish social and literary conventions, see Ulrich Langer, *Divine and Poetic Freedom,* pp. 149–82. For Du Bellay's resistance to elegant formal structures such as Ronsard's as a kind of moral criticism, see Greene, "Regrets Only"; for Du Bellay's originality in strategies of negation, see François Rigolot "Du Bellay et la poésie du refus," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 36 (1974): 489–502.

39. Sonnets 171 and 173 eulogize Catherine de' Medici and Jeanne d'Albret, the daughter of Marguerite of Navarre, neither with any apparent bid for patronage. For the contrast between Du Bellay's use of satire in earlier poems of *Les Regrets* and eulogy in later poems, see Yvonne Bellenger, *Du Bellay: Ses Regrets qu'l fit dans Rome* (Paris: Nizet, 1981), pp. 101–20 and 135–44.

40. For sublimation in sonnets 176, 178, and 180, see Roudaut, *Joachim Du Bellay,* pp. 51–55.

Eight Courtly and Anti-Courtly Sidneian Identities

1. The proclamation (quoted from Geoffrey R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* [London: Methuen, 1974], p. 161) was issued in the context of Henry VIII's declaration of England's legal and political freedom from papal jurisdiction. For the development of national state forms of bureaucratic government and a political culture built upon a national economic space, see Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), pp. 415–27; with literary implications discussed in Alistair Fox, *Politics and Literature in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989). For social structure and national change under the Tudors and Stuarts, see Alan G. R. Smith, *The Emergence of a Nation-State: The Commonwealth of England, 1529–1642* (London: Longman, 1984), pp. 165–94. For the formation of the national state as animated by a particular moral ethos, in this case based on a high degree of involvement by local ruling elites, see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), pp. 43–71. For structures of regional authority in sixteenth-century towns, cities, and country boroughs, see David Loades, *Tudor Government: Structures of Authority in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 80–166. For the fortunes of the late Tudor and early Stuart monarchy, see Loades, *Politics and Nation: England 1450–1660* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 231–320.

2. For the cultural division of the populace from its past as a generator of national identity, see Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 3–23; for competing voices in the public sphere and imagined community of the nation, see Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1–14; for religious culture as a catalyst of national identity, see Claire MacEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood 1590–1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 1–32.

3. Biographical information in Josephine Roberts, ed., *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), pp. 3–40; for Mary Wroth in the context of the Sidney family, see Gary Waller, *The Sidney Family Romance* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993); Margaret P. Hannay, "'Your Vertuous and Learned Aunt': The Countess of Pembroke as Mentor to Mary Wroth," in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England,* ed. Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), pp. 15–34; and Naomi J. Miller, *Changing the Subject: Mary Wroth and the Figuration of Gender* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1996), esp. pp. 65–87.

4. For Philip Sidney, see the biography by Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991); for Mary Sidney, see Margaret Patterson Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); for Robert Sidney, see Millicent

V. Hay, *The Life of Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Books, 1984). For William Herbert, see *Dictionary of National Biography,* ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 63 vols. (London: Smith Eller, 1885–1900), 26.226–31 (signed by Lee); and Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988).

5. For the range of English styles enfolding the Sidneys' efforts, see Heather Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 57–97.

6. For this background, see Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia" and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 41–124; Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 130–94; and Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Queen Elizabeth and the Making of Policy, 1572–1588* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 243–301.

7. In 1577, for example, Philip Sidney visited the Holy Roman Emperor to explore the possibility of forming a Protestant League between England and various German states; its failure ended his political dreams until the Flushing mission in 1585; see James Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney, 1572–1577* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 474–501. For qualification of the term *Protestant League,* see Ronald Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 18–19.

8. See Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix,* pp. 84–105.

9. For the *Arcadia* as veiled criticism against monarchs who delay public action while they seek to pursue peace at the expense of virtuous results, see Annabel Patterson, *Criticism and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 19984), pp. 24–43. For *Arcadia* as directed to a readership other than the conventionally assumed female audience, see Helen Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 101–15.

10. For the gravitation toward Italy and its various forms including drama and chivalric epic, see Alistair Fox, *The English Renaissance: Identity and Representation in Elizabethan England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1997), pp. 1–37; Robin Kirkpatrick, *English and Italian Literature from Dante to Shakespeare* (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 110–45; and A. Bartlett Giamatti, *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), pp. 1–11. For England's gravitation toward French lyric poetry, see Anne Lake Prescott, *French Poets and the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), pp. xi–xiv and 235–39; for the cultural work of French references in the interconnected social worlds of courtiers, lawyers, scholars, and writers in Tudor and Stuart England, see Prescott, *Imagining Rabelais in Renaissance England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998). For cross-cultural literary production in an age when skills in literacy almost always entailed polyglot competence, see A. E. B. Coldiron, "Toward a Comparative New Historicism," *Comparative Literature* 53 (2001): 97–116.

11. For English Protestantism as contending not so much against Catholicism as against boisterous rituals in theaters and other public entertainment, see Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); for the continued strength of Catholic ritual, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); for the persistence of Catholic liturgy and the rise of recusancy among yeomen, artisans, and husbandmen during Elizabeth's reign, see Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 251–67; for internal struggles between presbyterianism and episcopal conformism and their effects on the Puritan cause, see Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought* (London: Unwin and Hyman, 1988), pp. 239–52; and Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). For Elizabeth's via media negotiated between episcopacy and Puritan demands, see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547–1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 454–96.

12. So Freud construes the practice of religion itself as an attempt to solve the problem of deferred obedience through self-justification: "In this fashion totemism helped to smooth things over and to make it possible to forget the event to which it owed its origin" (13.144).

13. See Fox, *English Renaissance,* pp. 7–12.

14. David Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (London: G. Philip, 1985); and Elton, *Tudor Revolution,* pp. 415–27. For Ricardian and Lancastrian interest in the proto-absolutist paradigms of Visconti despotism, see Wallace, *Chaucerian Polity,* pp. 35–65.

15. For the politics of linguistic standardization in England, France, and elsewhere, see R. D. Grillo, *Dominant Languages: Language and Hierarchy in Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), with a focus on France on pp. 22–42, a focus on England on pp. 43–62, and comparisons on pp. 173–216; Ronald Wardhaugh, *Languages in Competition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), pp. 53–63; Robert Cooper, *Language Planning and Social Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 183–85.

16. See the restatement about these origins from a European perspective in Norman Davies, *The Isles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), with a focus on the Celtic, Roman, and Germanic migrations on pp. 45–227 and on Tudor perspectives on pp. 500–530; for the sense of British national identity based on dangers from without in conflicts with France, see Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 1–10. For medieval English kingdoms identified as separate communities, see Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* pp. 262–74. For representations of these conflicts in medieval chronicles, see Thorlac Turville-Petre, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290–1340* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 71–107 and 142–80.

17. For a reading of this passage as celebrating the civility of the English (radiating from London and associated with the monarchy) while disparaging the Britons (associated with the Welsh, Irish, and Scots), see Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity,* pp. 132–39. For the double structure of memory and the fantasy of a still uncertain future implied here, see Patricia Clare Ingham, *Sovereign Fantasies: Arthurian Romance and the Making of Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), pp. 51–74.

18. For varieties of Early Modern English and its historical foundations, see *Cambridge History of the English Language,* general ed. Richard M. Hogg, vol. 3: *Cambridge History of the English Language, 1476–1776,* ed. Roger Lass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Manfred Görlach, *Introduction to Early Modern English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 8–60; Görlach, "Regional and Social Variation" in Lass, *Cambridge History of the English Language,* pp. 459–538; and Albert Baugh and Thomas Cable, *A History of the English Language,* 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1993). For the rise of the London model as a response of high-status speakers to the influx of low-status migrants, see Norman F. Blake, *A History of the English Language* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), pp. 205–35. For the standardization of English based on the style of chancery documents, see John Hurt Fisher, *The Emergence of Standard English* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), esp. pp. 1–35; and Thomas Cable, "The Rise of Standard English," in *The Emergence of National Languages,* ed. Aldo Scaglione (Ravenna: Longo, 1984), pp. 74–94.

19. Letter to Thomas Hoby in *The Book of the Courtier by Count Baldassare Castiglione, done into English by Sir Thomas Hoby anno 1561* (London: J. M. Dent, 1928), p. 7.

20. For Chaucer's language as a traditional literary vernacular rather than as innovative or originary, see Christopher Cannon, *The Making of Chaucer's English: A Study of Words* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 48–90; for the fifteenth-century laureation of Chaucer, see Seth Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 146–208; see also Fisher, *Emergence,* pp. 16–35.

21. William Thynne *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer and Others, Being a Reproduction in Facsimile of the First Collected Edition 1532,* intro. Walter W. Skeat (London: A. Moring, Ltd., 1905), Aii^{v}. Tuke had been unable to profit from the work of Laurence Nowell (d. 1576), dean of Lichfield and one of the earliest students of Old English texts retrieved upon the dissolution of the monasteries. Nowell's name appears with the date 1563 in the unique manuscript of *Beowulf* later obtained by Sir Robert Bruce Cotton (1571–1631). For Old English antiquarianism sponsored by Archbishop Parker and Lord Burleigh, Nowell's patron, see F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1967), pp. 124–66.

22. For the canonization of Chaucer, Gower, and Hoccleve as a deliberate Lancastrian policy, see Fisher, *Emergence,* pp. 36–83; for the style of legal documents based upon scriptural parallelisms, parataxis, and sententiae, see Janel M. Mueller,

The Native Tongue and the Word: Developments in English Prose Style, 1380–1580 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 11–39.

23. *The Art of Rhetoric (1560 edition),* ed. Peter E. Medine (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), p. 188.

24. Thomas O. Sloane, *On the Contrary: The Protocol of Traditional Rhetoric* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997), pp. 193–274.

25. George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie,* ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 87.

26. For late-sixteenth-century London English as an amalgam of three distinct regional dialects rooted in Old Saxon, Mercian, and Anglian, see Helge Kökerwitz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), pp. 3–34; Görlach, *Introduction,* pp. 36–41; Görlach, "Regional and Social Variation," pp. 483–95; and Blake, *History,* pp. 209–12.

27. *Mulcaster's Elementarie,* ed. E. T. Campagnac (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 91.

28. See Richard DeMolen, *Richard Mulcaster: Educational Reform in the Renaissance* (Neuwkoop: De Graf, 1991), pp. 172–84.

29. Shakespeare, for example, assigned such locutions to the rebels of *2 Henry VI,* while Jonson travestied them in the language of clownish miscreants in *A Tale of the Tub* (1633). See Paula Blank, *Broken English* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 69–99.

30. George Gascoigne, *Certaine Notes of Instruction concerning the making of verse or ryme in English,* in *English Sixteenth-Century Verse,* ed. Richard S. Sylvester (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), pp. 317–28, quoted from p. 324.

31. Quotations refer to Van Dorsten and Duncan-Jones, *Miscellaneous Prose,* here quoted from pp. 97 and 112.

32. Sidney's incursion into archaism in this pastoral poem no doubt follows the example of Virgil, whose eclogues couched their political allegory in a deliberately archaic style.

33. Although Sidney begins his digression with the complaint that "poesy, thus embraced in all other places, should only find in our time a hard welcome in England" (110), he does not exactly demonstrate greater success in the foreign vernaculars. He mentions Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch as "the first that made [the Italian language] aspire to be a treasure-house of science" (74), and he alludes to Ariosto (pp. 79 and 105) and Tasso (p. 98), but he otherwise commends foreign poets who composed chiefly in Latin (Fracastoro, Pontano, Muretus, and Buchanan) or who earned fame equally for their Latin and vernacular compositions (Sannazaro, Bembo, Bibbiena, Hôpital, and Bèze [p. 110]).

34. Quotation from Van Dorsten and Duncan-Jones, *Miscellaneous Prose,* p. 11. For Spenser's *Vewe* and its implication in his political and literary discourse, see Andrew Hadfield, *Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 39–97; and Nicholas Canny, "Reviewing *A View of the Present State of Ireland,*" *Irish University Review* 26 (1996): 252–67. For Spenser and

Sidney as representative of a shift from regarding Ireland as the object of feudal plunder to regarding it as a colony for expanded commerce, see Bruce McLeod, *The Geography of Empire in English Literature, 1580–1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 32–75.

35. For the convergence of James's linguistic theory and his poetics of nature as an absolute guide with his political thinking, see Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 167–77.

36. For sixteenth-century reflections on the substantiality of words and their printed character as objective sites of defined meaning, see Martin Elsky, *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989); and Judith H. Anderson, *Words That Matter: Linguistic Perception in Renaissance English* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 24–40.

37. See Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), esp. pp. 1–20 and 180–200. For the image of London as a microcosm of England in the world of popular print of theatrical players, puritan preachers, and tabloid pamphleteers, see Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

38. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Histories of the Kings of Britain,* trans. Sebastian Evans, ed. Charles W. Dunn (New York: Dutton, 1958), 1.3–18; pp. 5–28.

39. Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 14–21, 28–35, 273–83, 291–95. Often the object of satire in early Tudor writing, London's commercial citizenry acquired a better reputation and greater respectability toward the end of the sixteenth century. For the growing recognition of positive attributes in urban figures, see Robert Tittler, *Townspeople and Nation: English Urban Experiences, 1540–1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 100–120. The word *citizen* in fact derives etymologically from *city* (cf. Italian *cittadino* and French *citoyen*) and implies a dialectical relationship between the population of a city and that of a nation.

40. See Susan Dwyer Amusson, *The Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 68–115; and Keith Wrightson, *English Society 1580–1680* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982), pp. 39–65 and 222–28.

41. See Rappaport, *Worlds,* pp. 217–71; and Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 18–57. For English society in towns and rural environs, see Williams, *Later Tudors,* pp. 160–227.

42. See Rappaport, *Worlds,* pp. 14–26; and Archer, *Pursuit,* pp. 4–17. Philip Sidney refers to the practice in sonnet 15 of *Astrophil and Stella* when he evokes the "denisend wit" of poets who sing of "poore *Petrarchs* long deceased woes, / With new-borne sighes."

43. For the heavy burden of family arrangements among the nobility, see Dewald, *European Nobility,* pp. 149–87, esp. pp. 168–76. For the late medieval predominance of the nucleated stem family over that of extended joint families even among the nobility, see Barbara Hanawalt, *Ties That Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Jean Louis Flandrin, *Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household, Sexuality,* trans. Richard Southern (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 11–49; Alan Macfarlane, *The Origins of English Individualism: The Family, Property, and Social Transition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 34–79; Michael Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 39–64; and Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450–1700* (New York: Longman, 1984), pp. 18–38. For complex relationships among noble families, kin, and neighbors, see Williams, *Later Tudors,* pp. 497–518.

44. He was knighted "Sir" in February 1583 only as an expedient of protocol to serve a proxy at Prince Casimir's installation in the Order of the Garter; see Duncan-Jones, *Courtier Poet,* p. 249.

45. For Philip Sidney's political thought, see Worden, *Sound of Virtue,* esp. pp. 227–52. For a brief overview of late-sixteenth-century court life, see Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), with Elizabeth's conciliatory attitudes toward the nobility on pp. 47–65 and the latter's involvement in council and court on pp. 85–105. For the function of bureaucracy and the attendant nobility, see Penry H. Williams, *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 81–108 and 293–310; for the structure of Elizabeth's court, see David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (Totowa, N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1987), pp. 38–95; for Elizabeth's personal relationships at court, see Neville Williams, *All the Queen's Men* (London: Macmillan, 1972), pp. 144–81; and, for the revival of chivalric ritual in the queen's court, see Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), pp. 129–91.

46. For Mary Sidney's decision to emphasize his courtly work by including in the 1598 edition the *Arcadia, Certain Sonnets, A Defence of Poetry, Astrophil and Stella,* and *The Lady of May* but excluding his translations of Psalms, Du Bartas, Mornay, and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* along with his letters, political writings, and family pieces, see H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 224–41. For Ponsonby's 1588 registering of Philip Sidney's now lost translation of Du Bartas's *Semaine* with Greville's efforts to edit his religious works, see Rebholz, *Life of Fulke Greville,* pp. 76 and 327.

47. See Brennan, *Literary Patronage,* pp. 59–91; and Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix.*

48. For Herbert's participation in the Parliament of 1621 and his views on foreign war, see Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 85–144 and 287–90; for major issues in national policy which drew Herbert's attention, see Derek Hirst, *Authority*

and Conflict: England 1603–1658 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984); and Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660* (London: Arnold, 1999), pp. 79–102.

49. Wroth's exchange of letters with Lord Edward Denny, baron of Waltham, the instigator of claims for recalling her published book, is reprinted in Roberts, *Poems,* pp. 233–45.

50. In this respect Pamphilia corrects the figure of barbarous Boadicea at the origin of English identity, resolving the double bind of recovering England's prehistory in an uncivilized past while exorcising incivility from it; see Jodi Mikalachki, *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 115–49.

51. For general associations of male libido countered by discipline and female piety complemented by compliance in early-seventeenth-century England, see Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 346–70.

52. For a study of the interplay between dynasty, destiny, and their geopolitical relationship to character in *Urania,* see Sheila T. Cavanaugh, *Cherished Torment: The Emotional Geography of Mary Wroth's "Urania"* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001), esp. pp. 195–218.

53. Published as a forty-eight page supplement to *Urania, Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* offers four series of poems, the first consisting of forty-eight sonnets and seven songs (P1–55), the second of twelve sonnets and nine songs (P56–76), the third of a crown of fourteen sonnets (P77–90), and the fourth of nine sonnets and four songs (P91–103).

54. Quotations from the first part of *Urania* are from Roberts, here quoted from p. 320. Barbara Lewalski speculates that the first series of poems constitutes the response that Pamphilia offers at this point in the narrative; see *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 252. For critical commentary on the disorganized nature of the second, third, and forth series, see Waller, *Sidney Family Romance,* pp. 190–219. For the sense of a progression in the four distinct sequences of *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,* see Jeff Masten, "Circulation, Gender, and Subjectivity in Wroth's Sonnets," in Miller and Waller, *Reading Mary Wroth,* pp. 67–83.

55. Her exemplars from Sidney's *Arcadia* may be the virginal Pamela and the chaste Philoclea; from Spenser's *Faerie Queene* the model would be Britomart. In the recently published continuation of Wroth's romance, the heroine marries Amphilanthus, but he departs immediately after the ceremony (Second Part 45–58). Eventually, her father, the king of Morea, dissolves their union, and she weds Rodomantro, king of Tartaria (270–76). She begets a son, unnamed, who dies before Rodomantro (406). Amphilanthus remains the love of her life, and ambiguities in the manuscript hint that he is the father of her son and that they perhaps will reconcile. All references to the second part of *Urania* are to Roberts et al. For

racial markers of darkness that designate Rodomantro as unfavored and peripheral, see Kim F. Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 187–210.

56. Early in the narrative, the sage Mellissea predicts that Amphilanthus will lose Pamphilia even though both desire their love to continue: "In loue my Lord (said shee) you shall be most happy, for all shall loue you that you wish: but yet you must bee crost in this you now affect, though contrarie to her heart" (*Urania,* First Part 115). Later Mellissea tells Pamphilia, "rarest of women for true loyalty" (159), that her hesitation will precipitate a crisis: "Destiny that gouernes all our liues hath thus ordain'd, you might be happy, had you power to wedd, but daintinesse and feare will hinder you" (160). Pamphilia nonetheless chooses to remain constant to Amphilanthus. In the second part she is persuaded that, even though married to the king of Tartaria, she may still love Amphilanthus "by ten times more hapy when enjoyde with Chastetie and pure innocent affections" (Second Part 378).

57. Quotations are from *Old Arcadia,* ed. Duncan-Jones, pp. 284–85. Urania inspires love in "two gentlemen" named Strephon and Klaius whose friendship forestalls jealousy. Both express love for her in the celebrated double sestina "Ye goat-herd gods, that love the grassy mountains" and in a "Crown" of dizains that anticipates Wroth's Crown of Sonnets in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus.* For the relation of conventionally gendered virtues to theories of state and justice, see Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 220–40; for their relationship to humanist ideals, especially of politics and ethics, based on Aristotelian and Ciceronian rhetoric, see Arthur F. Kinney, *Humanist Poetics* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), pp. 230–91.

58. "The sweetest fairenesse and fairest sweetnesse," quoted from 1590 facsimile ed., p. 2^{r}. See Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Sidney's Urania," *Review of English Studies* 17 (1966): 123–32. For the figure of Urania as registering an alternative to the representation of Pamphilia's female desire, see Miller, *Changing the Subject,* pp. 58–60. For grounding Wroth's romance in family connections controlled by brothers, see Maureen Quilligan, "Lady Mary Wroth's Female Authority and the Family Romance," in *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance,* ed. George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 257–80. For the focus of romance on destabilizing categories of social status, see Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600–1740* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), pp. 140–67.

59. Urania experiences a passionate love for Parselius, who turns out to be Pamphilia's brother and Amphilanthus' friend (First Part 23). When he marries another woman, Urania prudently accepts the love of a foreign king named Steriamus (265), thereby leaving her admirors, Strephon and Claius, wholly unrequited.

60. Pamphilia's constancy appears modeled upon the virginity of Elizabeth I; for assessments of Elizabeth, see Haigh, *Elizabeth I,* pp. 86–105; for sixteenth-century comments on her sexuality as a way for her people to express ambivalent feel-

ings about her position as a ruler, see Carol Levin, *"The Heart and Stomach of a King": Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), esp. pp. 65–90 and 121–48, Anne McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 227–39, and John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

61. For Philip Sidney's coterie, see Woudhuysen, *Circulation,* pp. 357–83. For Astrophil's greater concern with social consequences than with moral experiences, see Edward Berry, *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 101–41; and Anthony Low, *The Reinvention of Love* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 12–28; for the sequence as a mock encomium of the self, see Alan Hager, *Dazzling Images* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1991), pp. 103–14.

62. For an acute analysis of Sidney's paradox of grounding his success in narrating his failure and therefore rewriting the dependence that he controls, see Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire,* pp. 99–119.

63. Here is an example of direct reference to detail in a commentary not stated in Petrarch's text but extrapolated almost idiosyncratically by commentator.

64. See Kökerwicz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation,* pp. 220, 236, 242–44; and Eric John Dobson, *English Pronunciation, 1500–1700,* 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 123–24, 248–49, 425, 508–16, and 642–43.

65. For a fine analysis, see A. E. B. Coldiron, "Watson's *Hekatompathia* and Renaissance Lyric Tradition," *Translation and Literature* 5 (1995): 3–25. For an incomplete manuscript of the *Hekatompathia* dedicated to Sidney's political enemy, the earl of Oxford, see Woudhuysen, *Circulation,* pp. 93–94.

66. The rhetorical figure is *occupatio,* the pretense of passing over or denying what one in fact manages to say; see Chapter 11. Attenuated examples include sonnet 36, in which the speaker evokes Stella's "new assault / . . . thru my long battred eyes" by resorting to personification allegory and punning wordplay as he proclaims with an incessant *l* alliteration, a pun on *razed/ raised,* and the antithesis of *my* and *thy,* "And there long since, *Love* thy lieutenant lies, / My forces razed, thy banners raised within." In sonnet 62 he outrageously uses the word *love* thirteen times, each time in a different sense whether as a noun to indicate the lover, the beloved, the act of love, Cupid, sensual love, or spiritual love, or as a verb to indicate the functions of these agents, enabling him to conclude with the paradoxical plea, "Deare, love me not, that ye may love me more."

67. Quoted from Richard Tottel, *Tottel's Miscellany, 1557–87,* ed. Hyder Rollins, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965). For Tottle's paratexts, see Anne Ferry, *Tradition and the Individual Poem: An Inquiry into Anthologies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 13–15 and 69–69; and Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 233–34. For the volume's preponderance of verse epistles that establish the boundaries of early modern literary subjectivity and offer a voyeuristic peep into courtly practices, see Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of*

Henry VIII (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997), pp. 161–207. For the circulation of such miscellanies as humanist gatherings that criticize courtly behavior for a readership of urban merchants, see Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 168–86.

68. Quoted in Rollins, ed., p. 324. For analysis of this *dispositio* in the sequence, see Hager, *Dazzling Images,* pp. 63–81.

69. Woudhuysen, *Circulation,* pp. 207–13 and 356–84; for the potential of print to depersonalize the text and therefore to efface social and gender differences, see Wall, *Imprint of Gender,* pp. 70–93.

70. See chapter 11.

71. Robert E. Stillman, *The New Philosophy and Universal Languages in Seventeenth-Century England* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1995), pp. 55–74, quoted from p. 56; for the limitations upon a Parliament in early Stuart England and its indecisiveness as reflecting genuine confusion about the relative weight of local and national concerns, see Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–1642* (London: Humbledon Press, 1990), pp. 1–57; for the Parliament of 1621, see Robert Zaller, *The Parliament of 1621* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971).

72. Quoted in Stillman, *New Philosophy,* p. 56.

73. Quoted in Stillman, *New Philosophy,* p. 59.

74. For constitutional restraints upon a pacified and limited monarchy, see Glen Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 202–23.

Nine Family Narratives

1. See Duncan-Jones, *Courtier Poet,* pp. 232–46; and A. C. Hamilton, *Sir Philip Sidney: A Study of His Life and Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 87–106. A year earlier Sidney had been residing at his sister's "little court" in Wilton after his fall from grace with Elizabeth in the Anjou affair. He returned to court by New Year's Day 1581. The eighteen-year-old Penelope was introduced there in January 1581 and was engaged to Lord Rich in March, precipitating Sidney's passion for her in succeeding months. See Sylvia Freedman, *Poor Penelope: Lady Rich, an Elizabethan Woman* (Abbotsbrook, U.K.: Kensal House, 1983), pp. 37–48.

2. Clark Hulse, "Stella's Wit: Penelope Rich as Reader of Sidney's Sonnets" in *Rewriting the Renaissance,* ed. Margaret Ferguson et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 272–86. As master of the Court of Wards, Lord Burghley directed the traffic in marriage of young aristocrats who inherited their estates while still minors, and he personally supervised the marriage of Penelope Devereux to Lord Rich. For Astrophil's pursuit of Stella as an act of defiance against Burghley's power to manipulate the hierarchy at court, see Crane, *Framing Au-*

thority, pp. 124, 190, 186–96. For marriage arrangements at court, see Joel Hurstfield, *The Queen's Wards: Wardships and Marriages under Elizabeth I* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 241–96.

3. Philip Sidney's own aspirations to form bonds of kinship through marriage had already foundered upon the queen's policies. In the 1570s he apparently contemplated marriage with either a German princess or the eldest daughter of William of Orange but withdrew because such a union would have offended the queen. See Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney,* pp. 462–516; and Duncan-Jones, *Courtier Poet,* 132–34.

4. Possibly owing to debts incurred by Philip's continental travels that year; see Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix,* p. 29.

5. For the titles bestowed upon Robert Sidney by James I, including the largely ceremonial office of queen's chamberlain in 1604, see Hay, *Life,* pp. 210–32.

6. For circumstances of context, see Mary Ellen Lamb, *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), pp. 115–41. For women's readership of such translations, with detailed study of the shift in focus from Marc Antony to Cleopatra which Mary Sidney introduces, see Eve Rochelle Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on the Stage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 89–117. Other Senecan closet dramas associated with literary circles at Wilton include Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1594) and *Philotas* (1604), Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* (published 1609), and *Alaham* (before 1601), and possibly Thomas Kyd's *Cornelia* (1594) and Elizabeth Cary's *Tragedy of Miriam* (published 1613). The involvement of women in the production of closet drama is notable; one early example is Jane Lumley's translation of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1549); see the introduction to Lady Elizabeth Cary, *The Tragedy of Miriam, the Fair Queen of Jewry (1613),* ed. Barry Waller and Margaret Ferguson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 26–30.

7. For Garnier's political allegories, see Gillian Jondorf, *Robert Garnier and the Themes of Political Tragedy in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), pp. 34–37; for didacticism in Garnier's dramaturgy, see Donald Stone Jr., *French Humanist Tragedy* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1974), pp. 110–30; and John Holyoake, *A Critical Study of the Tragedies of Robert Garnier* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987); for Mary Sidney's effort not to counter native popular drama but to bring the Continental genre of historical tragedy to England, see Margaret Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix,* pp. 124–29. For Garnier's appeal in England, where his refined style countered popular dramatic forms, see Alexander Witherspoon, *The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924), pp. 6583.

8. All quotations from Mary Sidney refer to Hannay, Kinnamon, and Brennan, *Collected Works.*

9. For biblical strategies noted by patristic, medieval, and reformation exegetes of distinguishing a repeated image in a praiseworthy sense (*in bono*) or in a derogatory sense (*in malo*), see Carol V. Kaske, *Spenser's Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), pp. 18–64.

10. For the play's representation of women's power to intervene in the public world through marital interdependence, see Karen Raber, *Dramatic Difference: Gender, Class, and Genre in Early Modern Closet Drama* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2001), pp. 52–110. For the worldly Cleopatra as an antitype of the spiritual Petrarchan Laura, see Beilin, *Redeeming Eve,* pp. 128–37.

11. For similar fourteen-line set pieces as approximative sonnets, see Cleopatra's lament, "Soner shining light / Shall leave the daie" (540–53), echoing Petrarch's sonnet 145, and Antonius' list of contrarieties, "Well; be her love to me or false, or true" (919–32). For varied effects of Mary Sidney's stylistic choices, see Tina Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 69–73.

12. Quotations from Robert Garnier, *Two Tragedies: Hippolyte and Marc Antoine,* ed. Christine M. Hill and Mary G. Morrison (London: Athlone Press, 1995).

13. There is no record of public performance, but private aristocratic performance seems feasible. For its possible performance at Penshurst as an allegory of amorous retreat from the pressures of court, see Marion Wynne-Davies, "Literary Dialogue in an English Renaissance Family," in *"This Double Voice": Gendered Writing in Early Modern England,* ed. Danielle Clarke and Elizabeth Clarke (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), pp. 164–84. For the language of avoidance which blurs distinctions between Petrarchism and Anti-Petrarchism, see Margaret Anne McLaren, "An Unknown Continent: Lady Mary Wroth's Forgotten Pastoral Drama, *Loves Victorie,*" in *The English Renaissance Woman in Print,* ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), pp. 276–94. For genre transformations that achieve a feminist poetics of female agency in the play, see Lewalski, *Writing Women,* pp. 296–307.

14. Quotation from *Love's Victory, The Penshurst Manuscript,* ed. Michael G. Brennan (London: Roxburghe Club, 1989).

15. For critical study of these translations and the Sidneys' use of their sources, see Rivkah Zim, *English Metrical Psalms: Poetry as Praise and Prayer, 1535–1601* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 152–202. For diverse readerships, especially of Sternhold and Hopkins, drawn from the clergy, educated laity, and broadly heterodox common population, see Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 503–52. For Philip Sidney's practice and theory of translation, see Coburn Freer, *Music for a King: George Herbert's Style and the Metrical Psalms* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), pp. 72–108; Anne Lake Prescott, "King David as a 'Right Poet,'" *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1989): 131–51; and Roland Greene, "Sir Philip Sidney's *Psalms,* the Sixteenth-Century Psalter, and the Nature of Lyric," *SEL: Studies in English Literature* 30 (1990), 19–40.

16. For dating, see Michael Brennan, "The Date of the Countess of Pembroke's Translation of Psalms," *RES* 33 (1982): 434–36; for Mary Sidney's harsh assessment of earlier translations, see Margaret Hannay, "House Confined Maids:

The Presentation of Woman's Role in the Psalms of the Countess of Pembroke," *English Literary Renaissance* 24 (1994): 44–71; for stylistic features, see Waller, "Gendered Reading," pp. 336–39.

17. Both psalms deploy figural and rhetorical techniques of the sonnet form as well. The octave of Psalm 100 concludes with a paronomasia that links the pastoral *flock* to God's *folk* in the formation of a tribal nation and coherent state: "We are his flock, for us his feedings grow: / We are his folk, and he upholds our state." The sestet of Psalm 150, the concluding poem, opens with a chiasmus that echoes the ringing sounds of musical instruments, complicating the pattern of anaphora in the original text: "Let ringing timbrells his honor sound, / Let sounding Cymballs so his glory ring." For Mary Sidney's Petrarchan technique in Psalms, see Wall, *Imprint of Gender,* pp. 311–19. For Wroth's admiration of Mary Sidney's stylistic virtuosity figured in the positive representation of the queen of Naples in *Urania,* see Hannay, "'Your vertuous learned aunt,'" in Miller and Waller, *Reading Mary Wroth,* pp. 15–34.

18. For parallels between the Sidneys' agenda and that of French Huguenot translators, see Anne Lake Prescott, "Evil Tongues at the Court of Saul: The Renaissance David as Slandered Courtier," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studes* 21 (1991): 163–86; and Prescott, "Musical Strains: Marot's Double Role as Psalmist and Courtier," in Logan and Rudnytsky, *Contending Kingdoms,* pp. 42–68. For the impact of biblical models upon specifically English forms of nationhood, see Hastings, *Construction of Nationhood,* pp. 35–65.

19. See Prescott, "Evil Tongues" and "Musical Strains." For Clément Marot's translation of fifty psalms (1543) completed by Théodore de Bèze (1562), see the facsimile edition, *Les Psaulmes en vers français avec leurs melodies*, ed. Pidoux.

20. See Prescott, "Musical Strains," 44–49. For Puttenham's gendering of Elizabeth's literary efforts in "Doubt of Future Foes," see Jennifer Summit, *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380–1589* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 163–202. For analogies between Elizabeth and David in Mary Sidney's translation, see Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix,* pp. 90–94; "Princes you as men must dy': Genevan Advice to Monarchs in the Psalms of Mary Sidney," *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1989): 22–41; Elaine Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 142–50; for Philip Sidney's earlier representation of Astrophil as a repentant David, see Lisa M. Klein, *The Exemplary Sidney and the Elizabethan Sonneteer* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), pp. 96–102.

21. For Scripture's complex version of collective identity demarcated by geopolitical and religious boundaries, see Regina Schwartz, *The Curse of Cain: The Violent Legacy of Monotheism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), pp. 120–42.

22. For scriptural precedents for these conflicts and confusions, see Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (London: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 127–55. For reforms that de-catholicized churchgoers but left them sharply divided

about religious doctrine, see Collinson, *Birthpangs,* pp. 1–17; and Haigh, *English Reformations,* pp. 285–95. For the broad latitude of religious belief among post-Reformation readers of Scripture, see Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism,* pp. 553–90.

23. The sentiment had become commonplace by the time of *Areopagitica* (1644): "Why else was this nation chosen before any other?" See John Milton, *Complete Poems and Major Prose,* ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957), p. 742.

24. For the Hampton Court Conference see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism 1590–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); and Roger Lockyer, *The Early Stuarts* (London: Longman's, 1989), pp. 95–104, 158–67. For the Union of England and Scotland eventually effected by royal proclamation in 1608 without parliamentary statute, see Maurice Lee Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), pp. 164–95; Brian Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603–1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 168–97; and Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603–08* (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1986), pp. 1–57.

25. For James's religious ecumenicism as a genuine motivation in guiding him to unite England as well as warring nations in Europe, see W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 31–74. To the United Kingdom of England and Scotland in 1608 James would add the third kingdom of Ireland, earlier elevated from the status of feudal lordship to that of kingdom in 1542 to pave the way for Henry's exercise of royal authority over it; Wales had quietly been joined to England by Henry VIII, who exploited the Welsh origin of his name in the Act of Union of 1534, abrogating Edward IV's statute of 1284, which granted private jursidiction to the marcher lords. See Levack, *Formation,* pp. 168–97.

26. Hay, *Life,* pp. 144–70.

27. Peter Croft incorporates these names into the title of his edition, *Rosis to Lysa,* from which I quote. Hilton Kelliher and Katherine Duncan-Jones speculate alternately on the beloved's identity as Elizabeth Carey, daughter of Lady Hunsdon, a patroness of Spenser and Nashe, or as one of the queen's maids, to whom a cache of letters ruined Robert Sidney's chances for elevation to the wardenship of the Cinque Ports in 1597: "A Manuscript of Poems by Robert Sidney: Some Early Impressions," *British Library Journal* ser. 2, vol. 1 (Nov. 1975): 107–44. Croft suggests Robert's adulterous affairs with many women, including Gabrielle d'Estrées, the mistress of France's Henry IV, pp. 84–103. Hay casts doubt on a real amatory involvement in favor of associating Lysa's cruelty with the queen's refusal to grant Sidney higher office; see Hay, *Life,* pp. 196–209. Disclaiming that the sonnets represent a real-life extramarital affair, Hay stresses Robert's affection for his wife, Barbara Gamage, their mutual concerns, and their desire to be together in an unusually close-knit family, attested by their extensive correspondence and eleven children, pp. 171–94. Miller, *Changing the Subject,* pp. 64–88, likewise offers a pos-

itive picture of Robert Sidney's relationship with his family at Penshurst despite his frequent absences abroad or at court.

28. For unrestricted exercise of male libido as a compensation for discipline urged at school and in professional life, see Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination,* pp. 331–46; and Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500–1700* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), pp. 246–64.

29. See Ann Rosalind Jones, *The Currency of Eros* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 151–52.

30. For the labyrinth as a site of confusion and error viewed from inside and as a site of the poet's artistry from the outside, see Penelope Reed Doob, *The Idea of the Labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 17–30; for the labyrinth as a Protestant figure of inwardness and self-knowledge, see Huston Diehl, "Into the Maze of the Self: The Protestant Transformation of the Image of the Labyrinth," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986): 281–301. For Philip Sidney's use of the figure to represent a life based on the Protestant doctrine of election, see William Craft, *Labyrinth of Desire: Invention and Culture in the Work of Sir Philip Sidney* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), pp. 22–24. For Ben Jonson's use of labyrinthine dances in his masques so as to suggest magical aspirations to the sublime, see Thomas M. Greene, "Labyrinth Dances in the French and English Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 1403–66, esp. pp. 1448–56.

31. Mazzotta, *Worlds of Petrarch,* p. 79.

32. For a superb study of the labyrinth governing Wroth's thematic, syntactic, generic, and gender-based choices, see Mary B. Moore, *Desiring Voices: Women Sonneteers and Petrarchism* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000), pp. 125–50.

33. See compatible readings by Robin Farabaugh, "Ariadne, Venus, and the Labyrinth: Classical Sources and the Thread of Instruction in Mary Wroth's Works," *Journal of English and Germanic Philosophy* 96 (1997): 204–21; and Moore, "The Labyrinth as Style in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,*" *SEL* 38 (1998): 109–25.

34. I identify these responses as masculine on grounds of the conventionally defined double standard in sexual relations: a woman may not engage in multiple relations without destroying her honor and casting doubt on the legitimacy of her husband's offspring; a man might do so with less peril to the legitimacy of his offspring, if not to his honor; this situation does not of course mitigate the jealousy felt by wives of philandering husbands, nor does it mitigate the latter's guilt, but it does associate male jealousy with patriarchal anxiety about the transmission of inheritance to biological offspring, a guarantee threatened by a wife's adultery.

35. An arsenal of modern criticism iterates this point from a variety of illuminating and sometimes complementary perspectives. For Astrophil's moral bankruptcy, see Thomas Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences* (New York: AMS, 1989), pp. 193–242; for lyric's fictional mode in dramatizing the conflict be-

tween Astrophil's moral intelligence and his passion for Stella, see Roland Greene, *Post-Petrarchism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 63–108; for the tyrannies of court life as parallel to love, see Ann R. Jones and Peter Stallybrass, "The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella,*" *SEL* 24 (1984): 53–68; for Astrophil's inflamed imagination that results in his political passivity, see Herman, *Squitter Wits,* pp. 95–121; for a playful confusion of genre codes that enables his failure as a courtier and his success as a writer, see Roger Kuin, *Chamber Music: Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Pleasure of Criticism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 114–49.

36. For a study of this poetry as written in his youth for conventional pastime, see Waller, *Sidney Family Romance,* pp. 158–89.

37. Other proteges included John Grange, Joshua Pool, William Browne, Sir Thomas Nevill.

38. Quotations from Thomas Moffett, *Nobilis: or, A View of the Life and Death of a Sidney,* ed. and trans. Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1940). For commentary on Moffett's account in the context of Protestant aversion to poetry, see Herman, *Squitter Wits,* pp. 17–21.

39. Active resistance would have been associated with treasonable popery; see Glenn Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 208–24; and Henshall, *Myth of Absolutism* (London: Longman, 1992), pp. 120–47. The consensus of support for the king among both the nobility and the gentry rested on the specificity of England's common law. Trusting this specificity, the nobility allowed the monarch to govern with certain discretionary powers as a king accountable to God and therefore irresistible.

40. See Brennan, *Literary Patronage,* pp. 99–184, esp. pp. 137–46; and Waller, *Sidney Family Romance,* pp. 52–93.

41. For *Urania* as an approving representation of female passion, see Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction,* pp. 159–82.

Ten An Apology for Uncles

1. Quotations from *A Defence* refer to Van Dorsten and Duncan-Jones, *Miscellaneous Prose.*

2. See Margaret Ferguson, *Trials of Desire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 146–51. For Sidney's emphasis on irony as a stimulant to the rhetorical exercise of discrimination, see Hager, *Dazzling Images*, pp. 7–32 and 176–87.

3. Introduction by John Webster, ed., *William Temple's Analysis of Sir Philip Sidney's Apology for Poetry* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984), pp. 11–56.

4. See Patrick Cook, *Milton, Spenser, and the Epic Tradition* (Aldershot, U.K.: Scolar Press, 1996), pp. 81–93. For the relationship between pleasure and profit that requires aristocrats to serve the state while it defends their right to courtly diversion, see Robert Matz, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England: Renais-*

sance Literary Theory in Social Context (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 56–87.

5. These palpably gendered figures evoke an infantile dependence upon women whose sexual allure could divert mature men from the path of public achievement and worldly success. For threats of infantalization and degradation associated with a masculinized educational system, see Mary Ellen Lamb, "Apologizing for Pleasure in Sidney's *Apology for Poetry,*" *Criticism* 36 (1994): 499–519; and Joseph Lowenstein "Sidney's Truant Pen," *Modern Language Quarterly* 46 (1985): 128–42. For dramatic potentials of Philip Sidney's devaluation of the feminine, see Diana E. Henderson, *Passion Made Public: Elizabethan Lyric, Gender, and Performance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), pp. 33–84.

6. For the nobility defined as a military profession rather than as a refined class, see Merwyn James, *Society, Politics, and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 308–415; Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination,* pp. 122–50; Heal and Holmes, *Gentry in England and Wales,* pp. 26–58.

7. Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie (1589),* pp. 58–60.

8. Thomas Wyatt (1503–42) was the son of a privy councillor to Henry VII and Henry VIII; he joined diplomatic missions to France and Italy in 1526–27, was knighted in 1535, and served as ambassador to Charles V from 1537–40, for which he was imprisoned for several months in 1536 and again in 1541 on charges of undermining the king's interests; see Rebholz, *Poems,* pp. 23–29. For Surrey's career and his advocacy for a new type of English discourse in which poetry could become a basis for public expression, see William A. Sessions, *Henry Howard, the Poet, Earl of Surrey: A Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 175–99; for Surrey's sponsorship of Wyatt, see William A. Sessions, "Surrey's Wyatt: Autumn 1542 and the New Poet," in *Rethinking the Henrician Era,* ed. Peter Herman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 152–86.

9. Quotations from Rollins, ed. For Tottel's principles of selection and organization, see Elizabeth Pomeroy, *The English Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), pp. 31–52; and Ferry, *Tradition and the Individual Poem,* pp. 13–15 and 69–79; for a contrast between aristocratic and bourgeois values in producing such miscellanies, see Crane, *Framing Authority,* pp. 152–86.

10. Wyatt became involved with Anne Boleyn in 1525, when he separated from his wife, whom he accused of adultery; his appointment as high marshal of Calais in 1528–30 has been interpreted as a form of exile because of his association with Boleyn, and his brief imprisonment in 1536 has been attributed to charges of having information about her extramarital affairs. Surrey's quartering of the king's arms could be interpreted as his flaunting of a pedigree that legitimized his aspiration to the Crown, a possibility allowed him as a descendant of Edward III and a son of England's leading peer. For biographies, see H. A. Mason, *Sir Thomas Wyatt: A Literary Portrait* (Bristol: Classical Press, 1986); and Eric William Ives, *Anne*

Boleyn (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 87–99; and, on Surrey, see Sessions, *Life,* pp. 175–99.

11. Sir Thomas Smith, *De republica anglorum,* ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 72.

12. See Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982), pp. 39–65; Henry Kamen, *European Society, 1500–1700* (London: Routledge, 1984), pp. 93–146; Jonathan Dewald, *The European Nobility, 1400–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); and Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641,* abridged ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 62–95.

13. For a remarkable use of *consensus,* see Raphael Hythloday's discussion about the injustice of demanding capital punishment for crimes of theft: "If the mutual consent of men agreeing among themselves about manslaughter under certain conditions pleasing to them [si hominum inter se consensus de mutua cede, certis placitis consentientium adeo] must mean that it frees their henchmen from the bonds of this injunction [[not to kill]], then will not the law of God be valid only in so far as the laws of man permit [quantum humana iura permiserint]," in Thomas More, *Utopia,* ed. Edward Surtz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p. 62. For More's awareness of problems in replacing one norm with another, see Peter C. Herman, "Who's That in the Mirror?: Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Problematic of the New World," in *Opening the Borders: Inclusivity in Early Modern Studies,* ed. Peter C. Herman (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), pp. 109–32.

14. Patricia Thompson compares several turns in Wyatt's poetry to passages in Vellutello's commentary in "Wyatt and the Petrarchan Commentators," *RES* 10 (1959): 225–33, and concludes that Wyatt, traveling through Italy in 1526, had acquired Vellutello's edition, published a year earlier. But Vellutello offers only a scant commentary on sonnet 140. The commentaries of Antonio da Tempo, Squarzafico, and Sylvano da Venafro deal more elaborately with a scenario that Vellutello merely sketches.

15. Wyatt's Kentish idiom, perhaps modeled artificially on Chaucer's, betrays such provincialisms as the *-th* or *-s* inflection of third-person plural present verbs and the *-y* prefix in the past participle. See Helge Kökeritz, "Dialectical Traits in Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry," in *Franciplegius: Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honor of F. P. Magoun, Jr.,* ed. Jess Bessinger Jr., and Robert P. Creed (New York: New York University Press, 1965), pp. 294–303. Examples in this poem include the verbs *doth, presseth, campeth, lerneth, fleeth, hideth, appereth,* and *feareth;* Tottel's printing oddly regularizes *learns* and *takes.*

16. For Wyatt's sonnets as a Petrarchan outlet for feelings damaged at an emotional level by the Boleyn affair, see Alistair Fox, *Politics and Literature in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), pp. 160–67; Fox, *English Renaissance,* pp. 37–53; and Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 64–68. For a counter-

view, see Richard Harrier, "Notes on Wyatt and Anne Boleyn," *JEGP* 53 (1954): 581–84. For further literary consequences, see Anne Ferry, *The "Inward" Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 81–107; Thomas Greene, *Light in Troy,* pp. 242–63; and Barbara L. Estrin, *Laura: Uncovering Gender and Genre in Wyatt, Donne, Marvell* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 93–146.

17. For Wyatt as an outdoor adventurer in a New World context, see Roland Greene, *Unrequited Conquests,* pp. 23–36; and "The Colonial Wyatt" in Herman, *Rethinking the Henrician Era,* pp. 240–66; and "Petrarchism among the Discourses of Imperialism," in *America in European Consciousness, 1493–1750,* ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 130–65.

18. Quotations from *Poems,* ed. Emrys Jones. For recent comparison of these translations by Wyatt and Surrey, see Elizabeth Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey, and Early Tudor Poetry* (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 86–105.

19. For contrasts between the old and new nobility, see James, *Society, Politics, Culture,* pp. 308–415. Surrey's idea of England as a large entity appears in the corpus of his poetry with mention of such places as Windsor ("So cruel prison"), Norfolk and Lambeth ("To Thomas Clere"), and London ("A Satire").

20. Wyatt's epistolary satire would have had direct appeal to Philip Sidney in rustication at Wilton and Penshurst. Imitating Luigi Alamanni's satire 10 written in Provence upon his exile from Florence, Wyatt refers to his own rustication in Kent, near Penshurst: "But here I am in Kent and Christendom / Among the Muses where I read and rhyme" ("Mine own John Poyntz," ll. 100–101). For invitations in such poetry to the reader to invade the speaker's privacy, see Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 161–207.

21. For Philip Sidney's lifelong interest in the New World ventures to which this "cause" might refer, see Roger Kuin, "Querre-Muhau: Sir Philip Sidney and the New World," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 549–85; and Roland Greene, *Unrequited Conquests,* pp. 171–93.

22. For elaborate numerological patterns that emphasize Wroth's inner movement toward clarity and spiritual poise in contrast to the convoluted surface patterns of her uncle's and father's sonnets, see Tom W. N. Parker, *Proportional Form in the Sonnets of the Sidney Circle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 113–46.

23. For relationships between this event and the founding of the Roman Republic, see Debora Shuger, "Castigating Livy: The Rape of Lucretia and the *Old Arcadia,*" *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 526–48.

24. For the use of such rhetoric as relocating to court the threat of social mobility, see Rosemary Kegl, *The Rhetoric of Concealment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 11–75. For a Marxist interpretation of its value in articulating a new class culture as part of a process in the ideological production of social subjects, see Richard Halpern, *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 16–49.

25. James J. Yoch, "Brian Twyne's Commentary on *Astrophil and Stella,*" *Allegorica* 2 (1977): 114–17.

26. The most egregious examples occur when Astrophil lambastes extravagant poets in just those terms that poets themselves use, "*Pindares* Apes, flaunt they in phrases fine, / Enam'ling with pied flowers their thoughts of gold" (sonnet 3).

27. Leah Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds., *Elizabeth I: Collected Works* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 57. For the politics of Elizabethan nostalgia as both reflecting and generating criticism of James I, see Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 153–87.

28. The theme of choice and monarchical election in *Urania* also shadows the troublesome mechanism that German magnates deployed in conferring imperial title upon the Holy Roman Emperor. It provoked a crisis in August 1619, when the confederated states of Bohemia deposed their Hapsburg-appointed Catholic king and offered the crown to James I's son-in-law, the Protestant elector Palatine Frederic II. In addition to notes in Roberts, ed., xxxix–xlix, see Geoffrey Parker, *Europe in Crisis, 1598–1648* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980). For James's efforts to resolve the conflict through an ecumenical politics, see Patterson, *King James VI and I,* pp. 293–338.

29. For the figure as expressing cultural restraints of family and the social environment, see Nona Fienberg, "Mary Wroth's Politics of the Self," *SEL* 42 (2002): 21–36. For the Petrarchan pedigree of this figure with accompanying social and political overtones in Spenser's *Amoretti,* see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 216–35.

30. For the specific geography of the treacherous Kentish coast, see Richard Larn, *Goodwin Sands Shipwrecks* (London: Neton Abbot, 1977). For fiction and drama set in foreign locations that reflect on England's problems, see Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999); for reports by European travelers, see Antoni Maczak, *Travel in Early Modern Europe,* trans. U. Phillips (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). For the science of geography newly based upon cosmographical models of the ancients, see Frank Lestringant, *Mapping the World: The Geographical Imagination in the Age of Discovery,* trans. David Fausett (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 12–36. For political considerations as to which areas are represented most accurately in early maps, see Brotten, *Trading Territories*, pp. 151–79.

31. In contemporary terms his wars against the duke of Saxony evoke the disastrous events of 1619, when the Saxon duke contested Frederic's eligibility for the crown of Bohemia, splintering Protestant unity against the Catholic alliance (pp. 45 and 597). For English reactions to this event, see Hirst, *Authority and Conflict,* pp. 126–59.

32. I quote from the second edition of George Sandys, *A Relation of a Journey Begun An: Dom: 1610. Fovre Bookes. Containing a Description of the Turkish Empire,*

of Aegypt, of the Holy Land, of the Remote Parts of Italy, and Ilands Adioyning (London: W. Barrett, 1621), p. 3.

33. For Sandys the Aegean islanders "in habite . . . imitate the *Italians,* but transcend them in their reuenges, and infinitely lesse ciuill" (p. 7), while the Peloponnesian Moreans prove to be "well meriting the name of Merry *Greeks,* when their leisure will tolerate" (p. 14). For Moryson the region of Pamphilia is associated with the travels of St. Paul in Turkey and with the myth of the monstrous Chimera, a savage composite of lion, goat, and serpent subdued by Bellerophon riding atop Pegasus: "The chiefe City of Pamphilia is Zelotia, and in this Province is the Mountaine Chemera, upon the wild top whereof Lyons were found, as in the middle part yeelding grasse, Goates did feed, and in the bottome were Serpents, whereof came the fiction of the Monster." Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland,* 4 vols. (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907–8), 4.109.

34. For James's creation of "Great Britain," see Harding, *Formation;* and Galloway, *Union.*

35. Davies, *Isle,* pp. 45 ff.

36. The episode evokes the abuse of Petrarchan conceits that hold tyrannical sway over poets and lovers in Spenser's House of Busirane (*Faerie Queene* 3.11–12). Here, not unlike Amoret, Amphilanthus suffers psychic torment as he envisions Pamphilia lying dead, "her breast open and in it his name made . . . in Characters of bloud" (655). For Spenser's allegory of Busirane in *Faerie Queene* III, see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 249–50.

37. For the intersection of cartography and nationalism in sixteenth-century France, see Conley, *Self-Made Map.* For comparisons between Wroth and Mme de Scudéry, see James F. Gaines and Josephine Roberts, "The Geography of Love in Seventeenth-Century Women's Fiction," in *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe,* ed. James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 289–309. For the feminine iconography of *mater terra* as both civilized and dangerous in Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612, 1622), see Mikalachki, *Legacy of Boadicea,* pp. 18–37.

Eleven Prosthetic Gods

1. See James, *Society, Politics, and Culture,* pp. 308–415.

2. For Jonson's fusion of courtly and anti-courtly, town and country, classical and native, learned and popular, see David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge. Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 215–39. For Jonson's celebration of Robert Wroth's embrace of a commonwealth identity after ceding his family's local interests and resistance to monarchial consolidation, see Martin Elsky, "Microhistory and Cultural Geography: Ben Jonson's 'To Sir Robert Wroth' and the

Absorption of Local Community in the Commonwealth," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 500–28.

3. Quotations from Hunter, *Complete Poetry.*

4. For Jonson's efforts to objectify these word units as concrete correlatives of what they signify, see Anderson, *Words That Matter,* pp. 105–23. For silent connections figured in and between Jonson's poems so as to imply a meditation on the self as a product of its social relations, see Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation,* pp. 126–44.

5. For a study of how vicarious ownership figures an important part of the poet's ethics and aesthetics as it shows him gathering and transforming the materials of Penshurst in order to process, rework, and redistribute them in his own invention, see Richard S. Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. 44–111.

6. In later poems collected in *Under-wood* (assembled 1631, published 1640–41) Jonson would represent this process humorously by referring to "my mountaine belly" ("My Picture Left in Scotland") and "prodigious wast" ("The Poet to the Painter") as literary figures for his acquisitive powers, "voluminous" and "one great blot." See Bruce Boehrer, *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), pp. 80–111; Peterson, *Imitation and Praise,* pp. 4–20; and Thomas Greene, *Light in Troy,* pp. 273–93.

7. To reinforce this connection with the Sidneys, Jonson also published his epistle to Philip Sidney's surviving daughter, Elizabeth, the countess of Rutland (*Forrest*, epistle 12) in the folio edition of his works in 1616, modeling this edition partly on Ponsonby's folio of Philip Sidney's collected works in 1598. See Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 236–47.

8. Jonson's Westminster schoolmaster William Camden pursued a material approach to recovering the ancient past in the genre of chorography, an attempt to explore traces of Roman presence in the soil of England through the evidence of ancient roads and cities, tools and artifacts, coins and inscriptions dug out from the earth. See Peterson, *Imitation and Praise,* pp. 56–61; and Blair Worden, "Ben Jonson among the Historians," in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England,* ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 67–90.

9. See William J. Kennedy, "Is That a Man in Her Dress?" in Herman, *Opening the Borders,* pp. 27–53. For the exhaustion of Petrarchism in Jonson's "A Celebration of Charis," see Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences*, pp. 462–77.

10. See John Hollander, *Vision and Resonance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 165–86, esp. pp. 178–82; and Maureen Quilligan, "Feminine Endings: The Sexual Politics of Sidney's and Spenser's Rhyming," in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print,* ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty Travitsky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), pp. 311–26.

11. Germaine Warkentin, "Sidney's Authors," in *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements,* ed. Michael J. B. Allen et al. (New York: AMS, 1990), pp. 75–82. Compare Poliziano's judgment that the study of history is superior to that of poetry, iterated in Montaigne's "Of Education": "a study of inestimable value . . . the skeleton of philosophy, in which the most abstruse parts of our nature are penetrated" (Frame, trans., p. 115).

12. Quotations from Sir Philip Sidney, *Works,* ed. Albert Feuillerat, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 3.131. See Eugene R. Kintgen, *Reading in Tudor England* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996), for the reading of history books as a preparation for future action, an argument based upon Thomas Blundeville's "True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories," dedicated to the earl of Leicester in 1579, pp. 18–57 and 140–51; and, for the consequence of an Erasmian pedagogy that would transcribe the lessons of such reading, see Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structures of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996). For marginal glosses in Ben Jonson's works as indicators of readings that affirm, contest, or parody events, see Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), pp. 130–57.

13. For her marriage of convenience to another court musician, Alfonso Lanyer, and her child born to Henry Cary, Lord Hunsdon, see Suzanne Woods, *Aemelia Lanyer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 7–33.

14. Before Lanyer, other women who published include Isabella Whitney (*A Sweet Nosgay,* 1573) and Anne Dowriche (*French History,* 1596); Lanyer's attention to the details of publishing appears exceptional. For the power of women's lyric to enable the rethinking of women's positions in society, see Pamela S. Hammons, *Poetic Resistance: English Women Writers and the Early Modern Lyric* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Press, 2002), with a comparison of country house poems by Lanyer and Katherine Austen on pp. 149–63. For a salutary warning about assuming a progressive linear evolution of women's roles in writing and publication before 1700, see Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 39–65.

15. For Aemeila Lanyer as a "cultural Italian" who represented herself as a professional poet and musician on the model of Italian counterparts, exceeding the limits of social roles for English women, see Pamela Joseph Benson, "To Play the Man: Aemelia Lanyer and the Acquisition of Patronage," in Herman, *Opening the Borders,* pp. 243–64. See also Woods, *Aemelia Lanyer,* pp. 99–108.

16. For Lanyer's challenge to biblical authority in the context of women's roles delineated in conduct books, see Achsah Guibbory, "The Gospel According to Aemelia," in *Aemelia Lanyer: Gender, Genre, and the Canon,* ed. Marshall Grossman (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1998), pp. 191–211. For the use of varied genres in the narrative and dedicatory poems to bridge the separation between woman and God, see Beilin, *Redeeming Eve,* pp. 177–207. For Petrarchan diction in Lanyer's complaints, see Wall, *Imprint of Gender,* pp. 319–30.

17. For transformative possibilities in gender relations which expose the social and political status quo as a sham, see Janel Mueller, "The Feminist Poetics of *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum,*" in Grossman, *Aemelia Lanyer,* pp. 99–127. For Lanyer's complex construction of differences in her female community of friends and patronesses, see Kari Boyd McBride, "Sacred Celebration: the Patronage Poems of Aemelia Lanyer" in Grossman, *Aemelia Lanyer,* pp. 60–82; and "Remembering Orpheus in the Poems of Aemelia Lanyer," *SEL* 38 (1998): 87–108. For the inevitable divide of class and status which disrupts Lanyer's idealized community of women, see Goldberg, *Desiring Women Writing,* pp. 16–41.

18. Quotations refer to *The Poems of Aemelia Lanyer,* ed. Susanne Woods (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

19. For the loss of women's friendships that are disrupted by their commitments to husbands and kin in their obligation to marry within a class determined by wealth and economic status as represented in Lanyer's poetry, see Lewalski, *Writing Women,* pp. 213–41; and Woods, *Aemelia Lanyer,* pp. 115–25. For the estate as a colonial paradigm in other topographic poetry, see Bruce McLeod, *The Geography of Empire in English Literature, 1580–1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 76–119.

20. See Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism,* pp. 23–25.

21. For Pamphilia's apparent loss of freedom in a gendered context in which positions of masculine and feminine often elide, see Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire,* pp. 134–61.

22. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine,* ed. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, 4th ed. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1985), p. 355; Ronsard activates this meaning in "Ah, belle liberté, qui me servois d'escorte" 'Ah fair liberty who serves me as an escort' (sonnet 46, *Sonnets pour Hélène II*), in which his speaker complains about the labor of writing poetry, his legitimate offspring that will extend his patrimony into the future: "Afin de concevoir des enfans par escrit / Pour allonger mon nom aux depens de ma peine" 'in order to conceive offspring by my writings to extend my name at the expense of my pain' (Weber, ed., p. 443).

23. For the repetition compulsion of failure and conquest in the *Aeneid,* see David Quint, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 50–96.

24. Livy, 2.1094–95. For the relationship of Sidney's story to Livy's account of Brutus, see Shuger, "Castigating Livy". For the judgment of Brutus as subordinating one's biological family to the family of the state, see Ian Donaldson, *The Rapes of Lucretia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 119–42. Shakespeare's narrative of the event in *The Rape of Lucrece* quietly foreshortens its rebellious dimension by focusing on Sextus Tarquin's duty to uphold order and restraint, "For kings like gods should govern every thing" (602). Using this argument, Lucrece urges her attacker to exemplify true majesty by subduing his passions: "From a pure heart command thy rebel will" (625).

25. For a reading of the episode which treats Sidney's consideration of the

darker side of patriarchy and the consequent need for equity and mercy in the execution of justice, see Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 220–40. For Sidney's frustration with a system in which only the ruler may speak freely, see Richard McCoy, *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), pp. 110–37; for Sidney's hesitant endorsement of resistance when tyrants overstep constitutional limits, see Martin Raitière, *Faire Bits: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory* (Pittsburgh: Dusquene University Press, 1984), pp. 113–31. For Queen Elizabeth's reluctance to entrust him with political office because of his ideas about reform in her rule, see David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 91–108.

26. For Philip Sidney's ambiguous commitment to the ideal of scriptural poetry and his lost translation of the biblical Creation epic, *La Sepmaine* by Guillaume Du Bartas, the favorite poet of James I, see Prescott, *French Poets and the English Renaissance,* pp. 178–79.

27. Philip Sidney identifies himself as "a Dudley in blood, that Duke's daughter's son, and do acknowledge . . . that my chiefest honour is to be a Dudley" (*Defence of the Earl of Leicester,* in *Miscellaneous Prose,* ed. van Dorsten and Duncan-Jones, p. 134; for a superb semiotic analysis of Sidney's courtiership in terms of family and faction codes, see Kuin, *Chamber Music,* pp. 132–49.

28. "The Complaint" may represent Daniel's bid for support from Lady Margaret, the countess of Cumberland, as much as his dedication of *Delia* to the countess of Pembroke in 1591 may represent an attempt to cash in on the accident, or possible manipulation, of having twenty-eight of his sonnets accompany "so rawly in publique" Thomas Newman's unauthorized printing of *Astrophil and Stella* in that year. For Daniel's possible role in supplying Newman with the manuscript, see Woudhuysen, *Circulation,* pp. 376–81. For the "Complaint" as a Petrarchan coda to *Delia,* see Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences,* pp. 343–79. For the "Complaint" as a protest against the cultural confinement of female sexuality, see Ilona Bell, *English Women and the Poetry of Courtship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 145–51.

29. Quotations refer to Samuel Daniel, *Poems and A Defence of Ryme,* ed. Arthur Colby Sprague (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930).

30. The strategy evidently worked; upon his apparent breach with the Pembrokes around 1595, Lady Margaret befriended him and charged him with Anne's education to "engender many worthy stemmes whose off-spring may / Looke back with comfort" ("To Lady Anne Clifford," 93–94); see Joan Rees, *Samuel Daniel* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964), p. 63.

31. "I am not so far in loue with this forme of Writing [versified history] (nor have I sworne Fealtie onely to Ryme) but that I may serue in any other state of Inuention, with what weapon of vtterance I will" (*The Civil Wars,* ed. Laurence Michel [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958], p. 68). In earlier years Daniel had sought a different patronage for his *The Civil Wars* when he paid homage to

Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, "*Worthy Essex*" (2.126, 1595 ed.), the husband of Sidney's widow, Frances Walsingham, who might have carried Sidney's nationalist program to completion. Here Daniel alleges that, if the civil wars had not racked England from the abdication of Richard II in 1399 to the fall of Richard III in 1485, the nation would have attained preeminence by Elizabeth's time, with heroes who could "haue brought / Nations and Kingdomes vnder our command" (2.123, 1595 ed.). Later the poet dedicated his 1599 installment of *The Civil Wars* to Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, Penelope Rich's lover after Philip Sidney's death and her eventual husband after a shocking divorce from Lord Rich in 1605. Here, "by these essaies of mine" (Michel, p. 66), Daniel claims a link between martial deeds and linguistic prowess that guarantees a nation's strength. See Rees, *Samuel Daniel,* pp. 122–71.

32. The 1609 edition, for example, conspicuously omits this ending of book 2 in praise of Tudors, presumably in deference to the Stuart king and his own achievements; editions after 1601 likewise delete the stanzas in praise of Essex, who was disgraced and executed in February of that year for his role in conspiring against James I's predecessor.

33. For a comparison of Daniel's workmanlike rhyme with Sidney's more skillful sort, see Lowry Nelson Jr., *Poetic Configurations* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), pp. 127–44.

34. For a study of *Caelica* not as a simple renunciation of secular Petrarchism but as a more complicated mix of elements that are earthly, heavenly, and something in between, see Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences,* pp. 294–317. After Sidney's death Greville held successive appointments in Parliament, assisted Henry of Navarre in France, and served the treasury of the navy until his ideological opponent Robert Cecil rigged his banishment in 1604. When Cecil died in 1614, he returned to James I's court as chancellor and under-treasurer of the exchequer and was raised to the peerage as Baron Brooke in 1621. During his decade in retirement he completed these poems and *The Life of Sidney.* For particulars, see Rebholz, *Fulke Greville,* pp. 205–32.

35. Quoted from Fulke Greville, *The Works in Verse and Prose,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 4 vols. (Blackburn, U.K.: Charles Tiplady, 1870). For the compatibility of political realism with Protestant idealism in Greville's rejection of ornate rhetoric, see Kenneth J. E. Graham, *The Performance of Conviction: Plainness and Rhetoric in the Early English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 93–24.

36. Upon his own appointment to the Exchequery, Greville himself tried to reform fiscal policies and increase the king's revenues by encouraging good foreign relations, colonial expansion, and New World profiteering. For Greville's success and failures in doing so, see Rebholz, *Greville,* pp. 233–71. His appointment as clerk of signet and secretary in 1590, his selective investments in business and commercial ventures in London and abroad, his support of the Newfoundland fisheries, and his lobbying for colonizing efforts in the New World endowed him with a controversial voice in the final years of Elizabeth's reign and led to his denouncement by Robert Cecil at the beginning of James's reign.

37. *The Prose of Fulke Greville,* ed. Mark Caldwell (New York: Garland, 1987), p. 83. For reader identification with Sidney in Greville's *Life*, see Hager, *Dazzling Images,* pp. 145–66.

38. This idea pervades *A Treatise of Monarchy,* in which the monarch's intervention in the commoners' struggles against the nobility restrains the self-will of the latter and the mob rule of the former: "And as we do in humane bodies see, / Where Reason raigns in chief, not the affection, / Order is great, not wanton Liberty" (st. 657). Here Greville reinvigorates the meaning of liberty as the freedom of propertied classes to transmit wealth to heirs, but he inverts its Sidneian valuation with the adjective *wanton.* The object for him is not to transmit wealth, to which he was indifferent (Greville himself neither married nor fathered children), but to earn it as the sign of an industrious, purposeful life. For Greville's investment of nostalgic energy in Elizabeth, see Perry, *Making of Jacobean Culture*, pp. 184–88.

39. For the revival of feudal ethic and its cooptation by religious polemic in the early seventeenth century, see James, *Society, Politics, and Culture,* pp. 396–407.

Twelve Byblis and the Bible

1. For the birth of twins William and Katherine and their relevance to the illegitimate Andromarko and Faire Designe in the second part of *Urania,* see the introduction to the second part, ed. Roberts et al., pp. xxi–xxiii.

2. *Minor Poets of the Seventeenth Century,* ed. R. G. Howarth (London: J. M. Dent, 1931).

3. Henry Herbert, second earl of Pembroke (1534–1601), had taken as his second wife (before Mary Sidney, his third wife) Catherine Talbot, daughter of the earlier earl of Shrewsbury, while Henry's sister Anne had married the earl's son Francis Talbot. See Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix.*

4. For the dominance of enduring patterns of upper-class marriage arrangements over distinctive or innovative companionate Protestant patterns, see Houlbrooke, *English Family,* pp. 39–62; for the dominance of nuclear family ties and lack of concern about incest in England, see Macfarlane, *Origins of English Individualism,* pp. 3 and 62–79. For the nuclear family in historical context, see Edward Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1975), pp. 22–78 and 205–54. For sexual nonconformism in England, see Peter Laslett, *World We Have Lost,* pp. 153–81; and *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 102–59.

5. See Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680,* pp. 66–79 and 222–28; Hannawalt, *Ties That Bound,* pp. 105–68; Flandren, *Families in Former Times,* pp. 11–49; and Williams, *Later Tudors,* pp. 497–518. For the state's designation of the individual household as the primary unit of social control, see Lena Cower Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 1–12.

6. For a study of the incest prohibition as a political tool authorizing certain

alliances, prohibiting others, and reinforcing nationalist or internationalist sentiment in Tudor and Stuart literature, see Bruce Boehrer, *Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Culture, Kinship, and Kingship* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), esp. pp. 86–93; and, for a study of incest in literature as a powerful metaphor for various forms of social and political organization, see Richard A. McCabe, *Incest, Drama, and Nature's Law, 1550–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 30–55.

7. An important principle of this statute was to curtail ecclesiastical restrictions that increase the power and, through the sale of dispensations, the wealth of the clergy and to assert instead the priority of Scripture in setting rules for conduct. See Boehrer, *Monarchy and Incest,* p. 3; and McCabe, *Incest, Drama, and Nature's Law,* pp. 30 and 55. For anxieties at the core of cultural responses to marriage in view of conflicting assumptions about wedlock in Catholic and Protestant positions, see Heather Dubrow, *A Happier Eden: The Politics of Marriage in the Stuart Epithalamium* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 1–27.

8. Leviticus 18.6–23 forbids sexual activity with parents, children, siblings, half-siblings, and certain in-laws and between nephews and aunts, but it does so mainly to condemn the behavior of the Israelites' ancestors in the context of Canaanite and Egyptian practices that influenced them. For these texts as commentaries on legal and ethical problems in the narratives of Genesis, see Calum Carmichael, *Law, Legend, and Incest in the Bible: Leviticus 18–20* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), pp. 1–14.

9. Mordred defiled Arthur's wife, Guinevere, and led a revolt that ended with father and son killing each other at Salisbury; see Thomas Mallory, "The Tale of King Arthur," in *Works,* ed. Eugene Vinaver (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 1.19, pp. 27–28.

10. The history of Elizabeth's sex life is lurid enough as recounted in Marc Shell, *Children of the Earth: Literature, Politics, and Nationhood* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 59. The Succession Act of 1536, motivated by Henry VIII's desire to legitimate his marriage to Jane Seymour, declared Elizabeth a bastard on grounds of Anne Boleyn's incestuous adultery with her brother George, making Elizabeth both the daughter and niece of Boleyn siblings. A decade later Elizabeth fell in love with Thomas Seymour, the brother of her father's third wife and therefore Elizabeth's uncle, but who afterward became the husband of her stepmother, the king's sixth wife, Katherine Parr. See William Seymour, *Ordeal by Ambition* (London: Sedgewick and Jackson, 1972), pp. 215–22. Diplomatic efforts to marry her to Philip II upon her accession to the throne met her resistance on grounds that marriage to the spouse of her dead sister would constitute affined incest. In her later years Elizabeth favored Robert Devereux, the earl of Essex, whose maternal great-grandmother was Mary Boleyn, her mother's sister. Even her designated successor, James I, was the product of a closely endogamous union between Mary Stuart, whose father James V was the son of Henry VIII's sister Mar-

garet, and Lord Darnely, whose mother was a daughter of the same Margaret and half-sister of Mary's father.

11. Carmichael, *Law, Legend, and Incest,* pp. 91–101; and "Incest in the Bible," *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71 (1995): 123–47.

12. See Calum M. Carmichael, *The Spirit of Biblical Law* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), pp. 62–82.

13. See Davies, *Isles.*

14. For the conjunction between cosmology, fate, and individual emotions in the episode, see Cavanagh, *Cherished Torment,* pp. 149–62.

15. *Poems,* ed. Gaby E. Onderwyzer, p. 33.

16. For George Herbert's visits to Wilton during his years at Cambridge, where since 1609 he had studied and written three collections of Latin epigrams and elegies honoring the king, the court, and the English Church, see Amy Charles, *A Life of George Herbert* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 98–101.

17. Quotations from *The Works of George Herbert,* ed. F. E. Hutchinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941). Here Herbert's wonderfully ambivalent phrase suggests both a sweetness tightly or narrowly confined (*readie* = "made tight, taut," *penn'd* = "hemmed in") and one that is easily written (*readie* = "prompt, available," *penn'd* = "inscribed with a pen"), so that he may "copie out onely that," where the verb means both "multiply freely, extend at large" and "reproduce faithfully, duplicate within narrow limits." For Herbert's echoes from Philip Sidney, see Louis L. Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), pp. 265–78; and John Wall, *Transformations of the Word: Shakespeare, Herbert, Vaughan* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), pp. 224–37. For George Herbert's references to Philip Sidney and William Herbert as social gestures marking his entry into the literary coterie associated with the Pembroke circle, see Cristina Malcolmson, *Heart-work: George Herbert and the Protestant Ethic* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), pp. 46–68.

18. Michael C. Schoenfeldt, *Prayer and Power: George Herbert and Renaissance Courtship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1991), pp. 104–12, argues that, in such a poem as "The Collar," the speaker's nostalgia for order balances the terror of his exposure to an all-powerful deity, an absolute superior, a transcendent hierarchical authority. See also Schoenfeldt, *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 96–130.

19. For a structuralist reading, see Gregson Davis, *The Death of Procris: "Amor" and the Hunt in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"* (Rome: Ateneo, 1983), pp. 43–71.

20. Ernout and Millet, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, p. 689. Thus the Geneva Bible translates that Abraham's servant "put his hand under the thigh of his master, & sware to him." *Genesis* 24.9.

21. Rhetorical readings of Ovid in the light of scriptural parallels have a long history in medieval exegesis. See Ralph Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Stud-*

ies in Medieval School Commentaries (Munich: Arbeo, 1986), esp. 20–25 and 211–18; and Ann Moss, *Latin Commentaries on Ovid from the Renaissance* (Signal Mountain, Tenn.: Summertown Press, 1998) for the allegorical commentary by Petrarch's friend Petrus Berchorius, pp. 60–101, and the fifteenth-century commentary of Raphael Regius, pp. 29–60. For the allegorical transformation of Ovid's fantastic fabula into matter for theological and explicitly scriptural analysis in medieval integumenta, see Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 94–136, esp. pp. 103–17.

22. The single holograph of Mary Sidney's translation, located amid a transcript of papers sent by John Harington to his daughter Lucy, countess of Bedford, suggests a haphazard transmission. See Lamb, *Gender and Authority,* pp. 138–41. For Laura's role as protagonist of Petrarch's *Trionfi,* see Sara Sturm-Maddox, "Allegory and Spectacle in the *Rime* and *Trionfi,*" in *Petrarch's Triumphs: Allegory and Spectacle,* ed. Konrad Eisenbichler and Amilcare Iannucci (Ottowa: Dovehouse Editions, 1990), pp. 113–34. For the clustering of myth, transformation, and human experience in these myths, see Barkan, *Gods Made Flesh,* pp. 210–15. For Petrarch's syncretism in the *Trionfi,* see Zygmunt Baranski, "Constraints of Form," in Eisenbichler and Iannucci, *Petrarch's Triumphs,* pp. 63–85.

23. Quotations from *Trionfi* refer to Pacca and Paolino, eds.

24. See Kenneth Bartlett, "The Occasion of Lord Morley's Translation of the *Triumphs,*" in Eisenbichler and Iannucci, *Petrarch's Triumphs,* pp. 325–34. In his dedicatory letter Lord Morley reports that he earlier decided to translate the poem for Henry VIII when he learned that François I so valued a French translation of the *Trionfi* "as the rychest Diamonde he hadde." *Lord Morley's Tryumphes of Fraunces Petrarcke,* ed. D. D. Carnicelli (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 78. Lord Morley identified the French translator as a "grome of the chaumber with that renowmed and valyaunte Prynce of hyghe memorye, Fraunces the Frenche kynge" (p. 78), thought to be Hugues Salel. For an earlier identification, see Hélène Harvitt, "Les triomphes de Pétrarque: traduction en vers français par Simon Bougouyn, Valet de chambre de Louis XII," *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 2 (1922): 85–89. For the influence of the *Trionfi,* see Francesco Guardiani, "The Literary Impact of the *Triumphs* in the Renaissance," in Eisenbichler and Iannucci, *Petrarch's Triumphs,* pp. 259–68; and Gian Carlo Alessio, "The 'Lectura' of the *Trionfi* in the Fifteenth Century," in Eisenbichler and Iannucci, *Petrarch's Triumphs,* pp. 269–90. Elizabethan readers in general valued Petrarch's *Trionfi* more than his *Rime sparse,* as the number of its translations attests; see Robert Coogan "Petrarch's *Trionfi* and the English Renaissance," *Studies in Philology* 67 (1970): 306–27. The *Trionfi* was rendered in its entirety several times before 1600, but a full Englishing of the songs and sonnets did not appear until C. B. Cayley's complete translation in 1879; before Cayley, Robert MacGregor's *Petrarch's Odes* (1851) omitted poem 105, while in 1859 Thomas Campbell assembled for the Bohr's Classics Series an entire *Rime sparse* translated by various hands. See Fowler, *Catalogue,* pp. 151–53.

25. Jonathan Goldberg identifies the speaker of the translation with Mary Sidney herself so as to heighten the female erotics of "I" as a woman speaking of and to other women, thereby feminizing Philip Sidney by associating him with Laura, in *Desiring Women Writing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 114–31.

26. For this motif in Spenser's *Amoretti,* see Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch,* pp. 268–72.

27. For the heroics of Pamphilia's constancy, see Lamb, *Gender and Authority,* pp. 142–93.

28. For shifting relationships between locally defined and state-defined identities determined by a gender-specific opposition between home and the world abroad, see Megan Matchinske, *Writing, Gender, and State in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 86–115; and Maureen Quilligan, "The Constant Subject: Constancy and Female Autonomy in Mary Wroth's Poems," in *Soliciting Interpretation,* ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katherine Maus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 307–35.

29. Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* p. 122. See Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism,* p. 44, for a critique of equating the national with the cultural because it implies elitism and meritocracy.

30. *The Conquest of New Spain,* trans. J. M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 214 and 334.

31. *Heptameron,* trans. Paul Chilton (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1984), p. 504. For French motivations in exploration, see Jonathan Hart, *Representing the New World: The English and French Uses of the Example of Spain* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 155–232.

32. See Kuin, "Querre Muhau"; and Roland Greene, *Unrequited Conquests,* pp. 186–89. For England's initial gravitation to the East rather than to the Atlantic from a perspective of gendered interest in consuming luxury goods, see John Michael Archer, *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern English Writing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 101–38.

33. Benedict Anderson, *The Spectre of Comparisons* (London: Verso, 1998), pp. 58–74. For the aristocratic ideal as embodied by Ralegh in exploring the New World to counter the wealth and power of Spain, see Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 85–103.

34. For the slow evolution of the Pilgrims' conception of Plymouth as the Promised Land, at first construed as a Hell on Earth, see Conor Cruise O'Brien, *God Land: Reflections on Religion and Nationalism* ((Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 23–42. For gendered roles of power in the Virginia and New England colonies based upon Filmerian and Lockean analogues, see Mary Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers* (New York: Knopf, 1996), pp. 3–27.

35. Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* p. 45.

Conclusion

1. John Barclay, *The Mirror of Minds, or Barclay's Icon animorum. Englished by Thomas May, Esq.* (London: Printed by I. B. for Thomas Walkley, 1633), p. 26. For Barclay's career, see *Dictionary of National Biography,* ed. Leslie Stephen, 63 vols. (London: Smit, Elder, 1885), 3.162–64, signed by Richard Garnett. The *Icon* may be book 4 of the author's *Satiricon* (London, 1603; Paris, 1605), a Latin narrative that satirizes members of political factions at home and abroad.

2. The French and the English generally escape censure, the former for inhabiting "the fairest and richest of all Prouinces in the Westerne world" (49), the latter because, "as if in the *Ocean, Brittaine* alone were another world, all kind of dispositions are to be found in her inhabitants" (70).

3. Such topoi had already informed travel narratives of George Sandys and Fynes Moryson cited earlier, but Barclay profiles them with unprecedented detail and strong emphasis.

4. Belated states such as Switzerland and Belgium took root in areas that share no common language, while still others such as the Netherlands and Austria came into a pluralist formation through coalitions that agreed to share power.

5. For national sentiment and federative structures on the eve of the Reformation, see Michael Hughes, *Early Modern Germany, 1477–1806* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), pp. 10–29. For the reconstruction of German identity after 1648 to prevent the rivalries that led to the Thirty Years War, see Rudolf Vierhaus, *Germany in the Age of Absolutism,* trans. Jonathan Knudsen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 31–57. For the structure of German society in the early seventeenth century, see John Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime, 1600–1790* (New York: Longman's, 1991), pp. 152–76.

6. The chief stimulus for unity appears to have been fear of the Ottomans in the east, the French in the west, and the papacy in the south; see Heinrich Lutz, *Das Ringen um deutsche Einheit und kirchliche Erneuerung von Maximilian I bis zum Westfälischen Frieden* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1983), pp. 198–234, 364–69, and 393–403.

7. Eckhard Bernstein, *German Humanism* (Boston: Twayne, 1983), pp. 129–40; and James Overfield, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 298–329.

8. See Lewis Spitz, *Conrad Celtis: The German Arch-Humanist* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 93–105. For fifteenth- and sixteenth-century chronicles that celebrated the German past see Frank L. Borchardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), pp. 98–176.

9. For Luther's translation of the Bible as the basis of later German literary style, see Eric A. Blackall, *The Emergence of German as a Literary Language, 1700–1775,* 2d ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), pp. 1–19 and 101–48.

10. For biography, see Horst Joachim Frank, *Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg: Leben und Welt der barocken Dichterin* (Göttingen: Sachse und Pohl, 1967),

pp. 34–60; for critical study, see Leo Villiger and Christina Regina von Greiffenberg: *Zu Sprache und Welt der barocken Dichterin* (Zurich: Atlantis, 1952), pp. 37–67; for linearity and repetition in the sonnets, see Flora Kimmich, *The Sonnets of Catherina von Greiffenberg* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), pp. 24–96.

11. See Geoffrey Parker, *Europe in Crisis, 1598–1648* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 281–320. For social, religious, and political conflicts in the period, see Sheilagh Ogilvie, "Germany and the Seventeenth-Century Crisis," in *The Thirty Years War,* ed. Geoffrey Parker (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 57–86; and Christopher R. Friedricks, "War and German Society" in Parker, *Thirty Years War,* pp. 186–92.

12. For marriage arrangements and interactions between families and social institutions in Germany which differed from those of Catholic Europe only in public expression and external requirements, see Steven Ozment, *Flesh and Spirit: Private Life in Early Modern Germany* (New York: Viking, 1999), pp. 50–72. For spheres of action within which women moved in complex social relationships, see Heide Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon: Women in Early Modern Germany,* trans. Thomas Dunlap (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1998), pp. 16–112.

13. *The Adventurous Simplicissimus,* trans. A. T. S. Goodrick (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962), 3.18, p. 215. Opitz translated Sidney's verse and Valentinus Theocritus von Hirschberg translated the prose; a year later Opitz published his own pastoral romance *Hircanie,* initiating the vogue throughout Germany. See Curt von Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature: A Catalogue of the Collection in the Yale University Library,* 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958–65), 1.474.

14. For the formation of a distinctive Nuremberg culture at the time of Conrad Celtis, Hans Sachs, and Albrecht Dürer, see Gerald Strauss, *Nuremberg in the Sixteenth Century: City Politics and Life between Medieval and Modern Times* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), pp. 231–83. For later Nuremberg culture, see Gerald Gillespie, *German Baroque Poetry* (New York: Twayne, 1971), pp. 97–105.

15. Justus Georg Schottelius, *Teutsche Vers-oder Reim Kunst,* Facsimile: Luneburg, 1656 (Hildesheim: Olms, 1976); see Faber du Faur, *German Baroque Literature,* 2.81–82.

16. For the institutional identity of theory and practice among the Nuremberg poets based upon communally derived and contextually described standards that codify history and regulate languages, see Jane O. Newman, *Pastoral Conventions in Seventeenth-Century Nuremberg* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 132–85. See also Blake Lee Spahr, *The Archives of the Pegnisischer Blumenorden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960); and Renate Jürgensen, *Utile cum dulci: Mit Nutzen Erfreulich: Die Blütezeit des pegnisischen Blumenordens* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), pp. 22–99.

17. Georg Philipp Harsdörffer, *Pegnesisches Schafergedicht,* Facsimile: 1644–45

(Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1966). For Harsdörffer's onomatopoeia, see Wolfgang Kayser, *Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer* (Gottingen, 1962); and Faber du Faur, *German Baroque,* 1.135–63. For Harsdörffer's theory about music and the origin of language and for Schottel's theory of German as a natural language, see Jane O. Newman, *Pastoral Conventions,* pp. 69–131.

18. Faber du Faur, *German Baroque,* 1.95–111, 328–33.

19. Text in Christina Regina von Greifffenberg, *Geistliche Sonnette* (Nuremberg: Michael Endters, 1662: Facsimile reprint ed., Heinz-Otto Burger, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).

20. For such principles of plain style influencing Martin Luther's translation of Scripture into German, see Richard Marius, *Martin Luther: The Christian between God and Death* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 347–63.

21. For Spanish identity in the New World, see Anthony R. Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 126–55.

22. For Spanish colonialism, see Lyle N. McAlister, *The Spanish and Portuguese in the New World, 1492–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984); James Lockhart and Stuart Schwartz, *Early Latin America: A History of Colonial Spanish America and Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); and Leslie Bethell, ed., *The Cambridge History of Latin America,* 10 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984–92).

23. For the sociological formation of haciendas in New Spain, see François Chevalier, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico,* trans. Lesley Byrd Simpson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp. 23–49. For illuminating comparisons between the cultural and economic practices of Spanish "baroque hedgehogs" in Latin America and those of English "gothic foxes" in North America, see Claudio Véliz, *The New World of the Gothic Fox: Culture and Economy in English and Spanish America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 66–114.

24. For Sor Juana's interior life measured against its social, cultural, and historical background, see Octavio Paz, *Sor Juana: Or, the Traps of Faith,* trans. Margaret Sayers Peden (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), with particular reference to the court and convent on pp. 117–231. For Sor Juana's debt to Góngora, see Joan Ramon Resina, *Los usos del clásico* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1991), pp. 323–49.

25. For the cultural transplantation of Europe in the Spanish Americas, see Mariano Picón-Salas, *A Cultural History of Spanish America: From Conquest to Independence,* trans. Irving I. Leonard (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), pp. 85–105; and Paz, *Sor Juana,* pp. 11–62 and 277–386.

26. The first number in parentheses refers to *Obras,* ed. Plancarte and Salceda, and the second refers to *Poems,* trans. Peden, which I quote throughout.

27. See José Lemaza Lima, "La curioisidad barroca," in *La expresión americana* (Madrid: Bolsillo de Alianza, 1969), pp. 43–82, esp. pp. 56–69.

28. For Sor Juana's defense of her intellectual life, see Paz, *Sor Juana,* pp. 389–469.

29. For cultural analogies as apologias for domination in New Spain, see Mario Góngora, *Studies in the Colonial History of Spanish America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 61–66 and 220–29. For "Long Distance Nationalism" experienced by the colonialists see Anderson, *Spectre of Comparisons,* pp. 58–74.

30. See, for example, Sor Juana's fable, *Neptuno allegórico* and many of her *villancios.* See Paz, *Sor Juana,* pp. 185–90 and 250–54; and Lisa Rabin, "The *blasón* of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz: Politics and Petrarchism in Colonial Mexico," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 72 (1995): 28–39; and "Speaking to Silent Ladies: Images of Beauty and Politics in Poetic Portraits of Women from Petrarch to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz," *MLN* 112 (1997): 147–65.

31. See Anthony R. Pagden, *Lords of All the World,* pp. 43–45; and Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* pp. 50–65.

32. See Pagden, *Lords of All the World,* pp. 118–40.

This page intentionally left blank

Primary Sources Cited

Aldus Manutius. *Le cose volgari di messer Francesco Petrarcha . . . tolto con sommissima diligenza dallo scritto di mano medesima del Poeta, hauuto da M. Piero Bembo.* Venice: Aldo Romano, 1501.

Antonio da Tempo. *Francisci Petrarcae poetae excellentissimi Rerum uulgarium fragmenta . . . la uita e il comento supra li Sonetti Canzone e Triumphi . . . composto e compilato per il doctissimo Iurista Misser Antonio da Tempo.* 2 vols. Venice: Domenico Siliprando, 1477.

Bembo, Pietro. *Prose e rime.* Ed. Carlo Dionisotti. 2d ed. Turin: UTET, 1966.

Bible. *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition.* Ed. Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Bible, Septuagint. *Polyglotten-Bibel.* Ed. R. Stier and K. G. W. Theile. 5 vols. Bielefeld: Velhagen and Klasing, 1875.

Bible, Vulgate. *Novum Testamentum secundum sancti heronymi.* Ed. Johannes Wordsworth. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Tutte le opere.* Ed. Vittore Branca. 10 vols. Milan: Mondadori, 1964–83.

Brucioli, Antonio. *Sonetti, canzoni, et triomphi di M. Francesco Petrarca con breue dichiaratione, e annotatione di Antonio Brucioli.* Venice: Alessandro Brucioli e i Frategli, 1548.

Calvin, Jean. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Trans. Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1989.

Castelvetro, Lodovico. *Le rime del Petrarca breuemente sposte per Lodouico Casteluetro.* Basel: Pietro de Sedabonis, 1582.

Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier.* Trans. Charles Singleton. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1959.

Cariteo (Benedetto Gareth). *Le rime di Benedetto Gareth, detto il Chariteo.* Ed. Erasmo Pèrcopo. 2 vols. Naples: Accademia delle Scienze, 1892.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Works.* Ed. F. N. Robinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1933.

Daniel, Samuel. *Poems.* Ed. Arthur Colby Sprague. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Daniello, Bernardino. *Sonetti, canzoni, e triomphi di messer Franceso Petrarcha con la spositione di Bernardino Daniello da Lucca.* Venice: Giovanniantonio de Nicolini da Sabio, 1541.

———. *Sonetti canzoni e triomphi di M. Francesco Petrarca, con la spositione di Bernardino Daniello da Lucca.* Venice: Pietro e Gioanmaria Fratelli de Nicolini da Sabio, 1549.

Dante Alighieri. *Le opere.* Ed. Michele Barbi et al. 2d ed. Florence: Società Dantesca Italiana, 1960.

———. *The Divine Comedy.* Trans. Charles Singleton. 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970–75.

———. *De Vulgari Eloquentia.* Ed. and trans. Steven Botterill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Vita nuova.* Trans. Mark Musa. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Du Bellay, Joachim. *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse.* Ed. Henri Chamard. Paris: Didier, 1961.

———. *The Defense and Illustration of the French Language.* Trans. Gladys M. Turquet. London: J. M. Dent, 1939.

———. *Les Regrets et autres oeuvres poétiques.* Ed. J. Jolliffe and Michael Screech. Geneva: Droz, 1966.

———. *L'Olive.* Ed. Ernesta Caldarini. Geneva: Droz, 1974.

———. *Oeuvres poétiques.* Ed. Daniel Aris and Françoise Joukovsky. 2 vols. Paris: Bordas, 1993–96.

———. *Poemata et autres oeuvres latines.* Ed. Geneviève Demerson. Vols. 6 and 7 of *Oeuvres.* Gen. ed. Henri Chamard. Société des Textes Littéraires Français.

Fausto da Longiano, Sebastiano. *Il Petrarcha col commento di M. Sebastiano Fausto da Longiano.* Venice: Francesco di Alessandro Bindoni e Mapheo Pasini, 1532.

Filelfo, Francesco. *Il commento deli sonetti et cançone del Petrarcha composto per Messer Francesco Philelpho.* Bologna: Ugo Rugerius, 1476.

Gambara, Veronica. *Le rime.* Ed. Alan Bullock. Florence: Olschki, 1995.

Gesualdo, Giovanni Andrea. *Il Petrarcha colla spositione di Misser Giovanni Andrea Gesualdo.* Venice: Giovann' Antonio di Nicolini e Fratelli da Sabbio, 1533.

Giolito, Gabriel, et al. *Rime diverse di molti eccelentissimi Autori nvovamente raccolte.* 8 vols. Vols. 1–3 and 5–7: Venice: Giolito, 1545–56; vol. 4: Bologna: Giaccarello, 1551; vol. 9 (actually vol. 8): Cremona: Conti, 1560.

Goyet, François, ed. *Traités de poétiques et de rhétoriques de la Renaissance.* Paris: Livre de Poche Classique, 1990.

Greville, Fulke. *Poems and Dramas.* Ed. Geoffrey Bullough. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1939.

———. *The Prose Works.* Ed. John Gouws. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Herbert, George. *The Works of George Herbert.* Ed. F. E. Hutchinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.

Herbert, William, Earl of Pembroke. *Poems Written by the Right Honorable William Earl of Pembroke.* Ed Gaby Onderwyzer. Augustan Reprint Society. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library Publications, 1959.

Héroët, Antoine. *Oeuvres poétiques.* Ed. Ferdinand Gohin. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1909.

Horace. *The Odes and Epodes.* Ed. and trans. C. E. Bennett. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914.

Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey. *Poems.* Ed. Emrys Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Jonson, Ben. *The Complete Poetry.* Ed. William B. Hunter Jr. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1963.

Juana Inéz de la Cruz, Sor. *Obras completas.* Ed. Alfonso Méndez Plancarte and Alberto G. Salceda. 4 vols. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951–57.

———. *Poems, Protest, and a Dream.* Trans. Margaret Sayers Peden. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1997.

Landino, Cristoforo. *Disputationes Camaldulenses.* Ed. Peter Lohe. Florence: Sansoni, 1980.

———. *Publii Vergilii Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis.* Venice: Bernardino Stagnin, 1507.

Lanyer, Aemelia. *The Poems of Aemelia Lanyer.* Ed. Susanne Woods. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Lanza, Antonio, ed. *Lirici toscani del Quattrocento.* Rome: Bulzoni, 1973.

Lorenzo de' Medici. *Opere.* Ed Attilio Simioni. 2 vols. Bari: Laterza, 1913–14.

———. *The Autobiography of Lorenzo de' Medici: A Commentary on My Sonnets.* Trans. James Wyatt Cook. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995.

———. *Selected Poems and Prose.* Trans. Jon Thiem. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Luther, Martin. *Selections from His Writings.* Ed. John Dillenberger. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1961.

Marot, Clément. *Oeuvres poétiques complètes.* Ed. Gérard Defaux. 2 vols. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1900–93.

Mellin de Saint Gelais. *Oeuvres poétiques.* Ed. Donald Stone Jr. 2 vols. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1993.

Nichols, Fred J., ed. *An Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Ovid. *Heriodes and Amores.* Ed. and trans. Grant Showerman. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914.

———. *Metamorphoses.* Ed. and trans. Frank Justus Miller. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1916.

Peletier du Mans, Jacques. *Les oeuvres poétiques.* Ed Marcel Françon. Rochecorbon: Charles Gay, 1958.

Petrarch, Francesco. *Africa.* Ed. Nicola Festa. Florence: Sansoni, 1926.

———. *Africa.* Trans. Thomas G. Bergin and Alice. Wilson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

———. *Canzoniere.* Ed. Gianfranco Contini. 3d. ed. Turin: Einaudi, 1964.

———. *Canzoniere.* Ed. Marco Santagata. Milan: Mondadori, 1996.
———. "Petrarch's Coronation Oration." Trans. Ernest H. Wilkins. *PMLA* 68 (1953): 1241–50.
———. "La 'collatio laureationis' del Petrarca." Ed. Carlo Godi. *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 13 (1970): 1–27.
———. *Familiares.* Ed. Vittorio Rossi and Umberto Bosco. In *Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca,* vols. 10–13. Florence: Sansoni, 1933–42.
———. *Letters on Familiar Matters.* Trans. Aldo Bernardo. 3 vols. Albany and Baltimore: State University of New York Press and Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975–85.
———. *Letters of Old Age.* Trans. Aldo Bernardo, Saul Levin, and Reta Bernardo. 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
———. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems.* Ed. and trans. Robert M. Durling. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
———. *Le rime.* Ed. Giosuè Carducci and Severino Ferrari. Florence: Sansoni, 1899.
———. *Secretum.* Trans. Davy Carozza and H. James Shey. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
———. *Trionfi, Rime estravaganti, Codice degli Abbozzi.* Eds. Vincinio Pacca and Laura Paolino. Milan: Mondadori, 1996.
———. *Triumphs.* Trans. Ernest Hatch Wilkins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
Philieul, Vasquin. *Laure d'Avignon, extraict du poète florentin* (1548). Ed. Pierre Lartigue and Jacques Roubaud. Paris: Actes Sud-Papiers, 1987.
Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie: 1589.* Ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
Ronsard, Pierre de. *Les Amours.* Ed. Henri Weber and Catherine Weber. Paris: Garnier, 1963.
———. *Oeuvres complètes.* Ed. Paul Laumonier. 20 vols. Paris: Droz, 1937–75.
Saint-Gelais, Mellin de. *Oeuvres poétiques françaises.* Ed. Donald Stone Jr. 2 vols. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1993.
Sapegno, Natalino, ed. *Poeti minori del Trecento.* Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1952.
Scève, Maurice. *The "Délie" of Maurice Scève.* Ed. Ian D. McFarlane. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
Servius, Honorius Publius. *Servianorum in vergilii carmina commentariorum.* Ed. E. K. Rand et al. 3 vols. Lancaster, Pa.: Societas Philologicae Americanae, 1946.
Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare.* Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974
Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia).* Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
———. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The New Arcadia): A Facsimile Reprint of the 1590 Edition.* Intro. Carl Dennis. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1970.

———. *The Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney.* Ed. Jan van Dorsten and Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

———. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney.* Ed. William A. Ringler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

———. *Works.* Ed. Albert Feuillerat. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.

Sidney, Robert. *Poems.* Ed. P. J. Croft. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Sidney Herbert, Mary. *The Collected Works of Mary Sidney Herbert, Countess of Pembroke.* Ed. Margaret P. Hannay, Noel Kinnamon, and Michael G. Brennan. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Solerti, Angelo, ed. *Le vite di Dante, Petrarca, e Boccaccio.* Milan: Francesco Vallardi, 1904.

Squarzafico, Hieronimo. *Li Canzoneti dello Egragio poeta Messer Francesco Petrarcha . . . Io Hyeronimo [Squarzafico] gli ho exposti.* Venice: Piero Cremoneso (Petrus de Piasiis), 1484.

Surrey, Henry Howard, the Earl of. *Poems.* Ed. Emrys Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Sylvano da Venafro. *Il Petrarca col commento di M. Syluano da Venaphro.* Naples: Antonio Iouino and Matthio Canzer, 1533.

Thompson, David, and Alan Nagel. *The Three Crowns of Florence.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Tottel, Richard. *Tottel's Miscellany (1557–1587).* Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. 2 vols. 2d ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Tyard, Pontus de. *Les erreurs amoureuses.* Ed. John McClelland. Textes littéraires français. Geneva: Droz, 1967.

Vellutello, Alessandro. *Le volgari opere del Petrarcha con la espositione di Alessandro Vellutello da Lucca.* Venice: Giouanniantonio e Fratelli da Sabbio, 1525.

Virgil. *Aeneid.* Ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. London: Heinemann, 1916.

———. *Opera virgiliana cum decem commentis* (with commentaries of Badius Ascensius, Antonius Mancinellus, Pierius Valerianus, et al.). Lyon: J. Crespin, 1529.

———. *Publii Vergilii Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* (with commentaries of Servius, Donatus, Probus, and Christoforo Landino). Venice: Bernardino Stagnin, 1507.

Wroth, Mary. *The First Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995.

———. *The Second Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* Ed. Josephine A. Roberts, completed by Suzanne Gossett and Janel Mueller. Tempe, Ariz.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1999.

———. *Lady Mary Wroth's Love's Victory: The Penshurst Manuscript.* Ed. Michael G. Brennan. London: Roxburghe Club, 1988.

———. *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth.* Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983.

Wyatt, Sir Thomas. *The Complete Poems.* Ed. R. A. Rebholz. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Zumthor, Paul, ed. *Anthologie des grands rhétoriqueurs.* Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1978.

Index

Ahl, Frederick, 277n. 22
Alamanni, Luigi, 124–26, 349n. 20
Alberti, Francesco, 287n. 21
allegiances: familial, 23–24, 77, 80, 171, 181; personal across ranks, 8, 18, 23–24, 138, 170, 171, 204, 216, 220, 248, 261; personal among equals, 44, 48, 67–69, 80, 211, 259; political, 18, 44–45, 68–70, 82, 250; professional, 8, 18, 46–48, 80, 82, 128–29, 170, 182, 216. *See also* loyalty, networks of; national sentiment; social class
ancestral patrimony, 5, 15, 17, 50, 55; and Du Bellay, 82, 94–96, 99–101; and Petrarch, 23, 35, 37, 39, 50, 55; and Sidney circle, 229–34; and Sidney family, 165, 169–71, 186, 215, 218, 221–23, 226–27
Anderson, Benedict, 264n. 11, 266n. 19, 271nn. 62, 66, 303n. 45, 361nn. 29, 33, 35, 365nn. 27, 31
Aneau, Bartélemy, 86–87, 94, 119, 122, 128, 139
annexation of territory: through conquest, 58, 90–91, 137, 169, 232, 249–51; through diplomacy, 13, 79, 126, 197, 230
Antonio da Tempo, 3, 20, 27, 39, 64, 70, 98, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 71; —, *son. 1*, 62; —, *son. 15*, 65; —, *son. 140*, 205; —, *son. 159*, 65–66; —, *son. 248*, 141; —, *son. 262*, 209
Aragonese Naples, 56, 61, 67–68, 70, 72
Ariosto, Ludovico, 8, 116, 155
aristocracy: by birth, 55–56, 78–79, 93, 150, 167, 179, 187, 201, 207; by inheritance, 19, 171, 212, 213, 222, 232; landed, 18–19, 30, 78, 93, 179, 187, 201, 222, 232; merited through attainment, 55, 78–79, 86, 104, 150, 201, 215, 232; urban, 18–19, 55, 86, 93, 167. *See also* courtly ethos; social class
Arroyo, Ciriaco Morón, 270n. 54
Ascoli, Albert Russell, 277n. 20
Atticus, 24
Augustine, St., 28, 29, 36, 38, 45, 52, 59

Bacon, Francis, 178–80
Balibar, Etienne, 272n. 68, 70
Barclay, John, 251–52
Beaune, Colette, 266n. 17, 270n. 59, 283n. 27, 301nn. 25, 26, 28, 30, 305n. 58
Bembo, Pietro, 2–4, 16, 20, 44, 87–88, 111, 117–18, 165
Bernardo, Aldo, 273n. 2, 274n. 4, 275nn. 14, 15, 276nn. 17, 21, 279nn. 36, 38, 40, 280n. 8, 282n. 22
Bible. *See* Scripture
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 3, 27, 39, 42, 46, 60, 61, 67, 87; commentary on Dante, 57; *Fiammeta*, 55; *Filocolo*, 55; *Ninfale fiesolano*, 55; *Rime*, 54–57
Boscán, Juan, 4, 83–85, 165
Bourdieu, Pierre, 272nn. 68, 70, 300n. 16
Britons, 14, 166, 170, 213–14
Brittany, 14, 80–81, 103, 105, 106
Brucioli, Antonio, 3, 20, 52, 98, 147, 251; and Petrarch, *son. 45*, 246–27; —, *son. 113–15*, 147; —, *son. 136–38*, 155; —, *son. 140*, 207; —, *son. 262*, 209
Brut, 15, 170, 214
Brutus, Junius, opponent of Tarquin, 30, 35, 222–23
Budé, Guillaume, 92–93

bureaucratic apparatus of state: in England, 163, 171, 179, 185, 231; in France, 79, 86, 91, 103–4, 148; in Italy, 7, 26, 61. *See also* nation; nation-state
Burgundy, 14, 80, 81, 103, 105, 106
Bushnell, Rebecca, 335n. 35
Byblis, 236, 238, 239–40, 242–46, 248

Calvin, Jean, 110, 130–31, 137, 184; and Calvinist doctrine, 131, 155, 164, 165, 212, 219
Cariteo (Benedetto Gareth), 67–73, 107, 253
Carmichael, Calum, 358n. 8, 359nn. 11, 12
Castelvetro, Lodovico, 3, 20, 60, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 52–53; —, *son. 45*, 247; —, *son. 68*, 281n. 14; —, *son. 113–15*, 147–48; —, *son. 140*, 207; —, *son. 169*, 225, 227; —, *son. 229*, 98; —, *son. 262*, 209
Castiglione, Baldassare, 3, 116, 194, 252, 300n. 17, 318n. 5
Celts, 14, 80, 81, 166
Charlemagne, 13, 55, 81, 82
Charles IV of Luxembourg, 9, 10, 36, 50
Charles V of Spain, 13, 50, 77, 79, 81–83, 117, 126, 134–37, 148
Charles VIII of France, 67, 70, 72, 106
Chartier, Alain, 85–86, 94, 100, 103, 107
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 166–67, 198
Cicero, 11, 24–25, 34, 87–90, 93, 94, 142, 259
Cino da Pistoia, 43, 46, 47, 57
classics, ancient: commentary on, 59–60, 92, 102, 156, 198; educational value of, 79–80, 95, 103, 119, 122, 252; literary imitation of, 3–5, 77, 95, 104–5, 123, 125, 149
Clifford, Lady Margaret, 219–20, 229
Clovis, 13, 14, 81, 114, 252
Cohen, Walter, 266n. 16
Cola di Rienzo, 10, 30, 34–36, 38
commentaries, 1–3, 4, 7, 16, 20, 26–27, 39–53, 58; on classics, 59–60, 92, 102, 156, 198; on English literature, 176–78, 196–97, 198, 199–200; on French literature, 99, 102–4, 118–20, 149; on German literature, 255; on Italian literature, 27–28, 46–48, 55–56, 60–62; on Scripture, 184–86, 240–41; self-commentary, 22–26, 58–59, 62–67; on Spanish literature, 83–84
Conley, Tom, 266n. 18, 269n. 44, 309n. 14, 313n. 35, 314n. 37, 326n. 6, 351n. 37
courtly ethos: aristocratic distinction, 45–46, 93, 96, 101, 124–26, 139, 150, 156, 158, 167, 171, 173–74, 177–78, 226; noble privilege, 55–57, 77, 91, 110, 145, 180, 199, 207–8; service to state, 7, 19, 45–46, 67–73, 79–80, 82, 168, 170, 177–78, 180, 202–4, 232, 251. *See also* allegiances; nobility
cultural diversity, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19, 57, 68; in England, 166–70, 214, 216, 235, 253–54; in France, 80–81, 117, 121, 127, 257
cultural hegemony, 5, 14, 15; in England, 170, 203–4; in France, 82, 85–86, 100–101, 104, 119; in Italy, 4, 57, 58, 61–62, 70, 71; in Spain, 83–84

Daniel, Samuel, 229–31
Daniello, Bernardino, 3, 20, 60, 117, 132, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 51; —, *canz. 323*, 136–37; —, *son. 16*, 192; —, *son. 45*, 246–47; —, *son. 97*, 222–23; —, *son. 115*, 150; —, *son. 140*, 206; —, *son. 169*, 225–26; —, *son. 229*, 98; —, *son. 248*, 142; —, *son. 262*, 209; —, *son. 355*, 132
Dante Alighieri, 39, 47, 57, 60, 61, 64, 84, 259; attitude of Petrarch toward, 27–28; *De vulgari eloquentia*, 9, 19; *Inferno 10*, 9; *Inferno 26*, 25; *Purgatorio 6*, 9
Davanzati, Mariotto, 288n. 22
David, psalms attributed to, 35, 184, 240
Defaux, Gérard, 309n. 16, 310n. 20, 312n. 27, 314nn. 37, 41, 42, 43, 315nn. 45, 46, 321n. 27
DellaNeva, JoAnn, 317n. 1, 318n. 3, 322n. 31, 323n. 39, 325n. 1

Dolet, Etienne, 87–88, 107, 127
Dorat, Jean, 79, 86, 140, 142, 151
Du Bellay, Joachim, 6, 8, 165, 174, 193; and education, 79–80, 86; and family, 177–78; and Jean du Bellay, 78, 91, 145, 146, 148, 153; and service to the Crown, 79–80, 91–94, 104, 113
—, works: *L'anterotique*, 78, 116, 151; *Les Antiquitéz*, 77, 78, 134–36; *Contre les pétrarquistes*, 151; *Deffence*, 4, 16, 78–79, 86–96, 115–16, 121–22, 125–26, 133, 140–43, 150, 158, 230, 261; "Epitaphe de Clément Marot," 104–7, 112; *Musagnoemachie*, 116, 151; *Le poëte courtisan*, 152; *Recueil de poésie*, 123, 125; *Les Regrets*, 77, 78, 134, 139, 153–58; *Songe*, 77, 78, 134, 136–37; *Sonnets d'honeste amour*, 78; *Vers lyriques,* 78, 89, 92, 116, 151
—, *Olive*, 4, 8, 77–79, 82, 86, 92, 104, 122, 256; *son. 5*, 130; *son. 10*, 128; *son. 60*, 138, 140; *son. 61*, 138, 141; *son. 62*, 115–16, 118–19, 126, 135, 138, 141–43; *son. 69*, 145; *son. 83*, 146, 149; *son. 93*, 96–99; *son. 94*, 143–44; *son. 96–104*, 130; *son. 105*, 129–30; *son. 106*, 150; *son. 107–11*, 130–31; *son. 112*, 131–32; *son. 113*, 132–33
Dubrow, Heather, 266n. 22, 331n. 5, 339n. 62, 354n. 21, 358n. 7
Duval, Edwin, 317n. 1

Elizabeth I of England, 7, 8, 178, 215, 218; as literary model, 182, 184, 212, 235; and political policy, 164, 203, 226, 232, 234
empire, 5, 51, 71, 82, 163; ancient Roman, 5, 29–30, 31, 33–34, 61–62, 77, 88, 89–90, 230; Hapsburg, 77–78, 83–84, 134–37, 164, 168, 182, 232, 253–54; Holy Roman, 8–10, 13, 29, 49–50, 77, 81–83, 91, 213. *See also* national identity; national sentiment
endogamy, 7, 95, 122, 233–35. *See also* nobility
England: entity and idea of, 14–15, 163, 166–67, 185–86, 213–14, 252–53, 344n. 25; name of, 15
English language: literary vernacular, 4, 16, 168, 170, 202, 203, 229–30, 250; spoken vernacular, 16, 166–70, 178–79, 205
erotic imagination, 2, 18; and Du Bellay, 128, 130; and Petrarch, 29, 44, 53, 58; and Sidney circle, 170–73, 188–89, 227–28, 245–46, 248–49
Estienne, Robert, 16, 120, 122
ethnic diversity: in England, 14, 166–70, 213–14; in France, 14, 80–81; in Germany, 13; in Italy, 9, 56; in Spain, 13, 14, 83
ethnos, 11, 12, 53, 185–86
exile, 5, 10–11; and Alamanni, 124–25; and Dante, 60; Du Bellay's imagination of, 153–55; Marot's period of, 107; and Ovid, 77, 154; Petrarch's experience of, 23, 34, 43
exogamy, 18, 38, 95, 122, 220, 234–35. *See also* social class

family romance, 5, 37–39, 55, 58, 152, 189–90
family structures, 55, 78–79, 163, 171, 181, 187, 219, 233–34, 253
father tongue, 17, 168
Fausto da Longiano, 3, 20, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 51–52; —, *canz. 323*, 136; —, *son. 16*, 192; —, *son. 115*, 147–48; —, *son. 140*, 206–7; —, *son. 167*, 143; —, *son. 169*, 225; —, *son. 229*, 98; —, *son. 247*, 142; —, *son. 262*, 209; —, *son. 362*, 132
Filelfo, Francesco, 3, 20, 26–27, 70, 106, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 48–49, 71; —, *son. 1*, 62–64; —, *son. 8*, 40; —, *son. 15*, 64–65; —, *son. 16*, 39, 191; —, *son. 20*, 140; —, *son. 25–28*, 43–44; —, *son. 67–69*, 41–43; —, *son. 78*, 41; —, *son. 98*, 40
Florence, 2, 10, 31, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 56–57; Republic of, 5, 10, 11, 39, 55, 57, 58–67, 91; ruled by Medici, 2, 5, 44, 58–59, 61–67, 91, 117

Fontainebleau, 95, 119, 124–26
France: entity and idea of, 14–15, 81, 164, 249, 252; name of, 81
François I of France, 78, 80–82, 91–92, 96, 107, 110, 113, 123–25
Francus, 15, 55, 81
fraternal clan, 38, 36–48, 94–95, 118, 136, 178
fratricidal strife, 5, 6, 38; and cultural hegemony, 5, 6, 53, 60, 95, 116, 122, 133, 142–44, 157; and political order, 37, 48, 51, 53, 57, 64, 80, 118, 122, 137, 174. *See also* taboo; totems
French language: literary vernacular, 4, 82, 86, 100–103, 105–6, 113, 119–21; orthography, 121; spoken vernacular, 15–16, 82, 86, 100–101, 105–6, 119–21
Freud, Sigmund, 265nn. 13, 14, 285n. 6; *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 217–18; "Family Romances," 5, 55, 152, 189–90; *Totem and Taboo*, 5, 38, 94–95, 165, 332n. 12

Gallican Church (France), 7, 80, 91, 110, 130, 137, 148, 305n. 61
Gambara, Veronica, 116, 131–33
Garcilaso de la Vega, 4, 83–85
Garnier, Robert, 182–83
Gellner, Ernest, 263n. 11, 265n. 16, 271n. 65
gender and education, 17, 78; in father tongues, 17, 167–68, 254, 257; and masculinist prejudices, 100, 187, 201, 210–11, 218, 257
gender and translocal identity, 18, 25, 219–20
gendered figuration: and hierarchical status, 16–17, 40–41, 99, 100, 172, 192–93, 200–202, 208, 209–20, 217, 226, 242; of homeland as father, 17, 37, 53, 117, 169, 260; of homeland as mother, 9, 17, 114, 140–41, 154, 219–20, 257–58, 284n. 34; of men as women, 25, 123–24, 242–43, 278n. 33; of women as men, 123, 188, 190, 246–47, 297n. 3
Geneva Bible, xi, 11–12, 184–86, 240–41
gens, gentes, 10, 11, 53, 185–86, 196
geographic unity: in England, imagined, 166, 184–85, 213–14; in France, 83, 102, 112–13, 116; in Italy, 9, 10, 11, 12, 29, 36, 117
German language, 255
Germany: entity and idea of, 2, 6, 7, 12–13, 253–57; name of, 12–13
Gesualdo, Giovanni Andrea, 3, 20, 60, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 50, 284n. 33; —, *canz. 360*, 260; —, *son. 16*, 192; —, *son. 45*, 246; —, *son. 97*, 222, 227; —, *son. 115*, 150; —, *son. 140*, 206; —, *son. 169*, 225; —, *son. 211*, 189; —, *son. 212*, 259; —, *son. 229*, 98; —, *son. 248*, 110, 175; —, *son. 262*, 210; —, *son. 366*, 132
Ghibellines, 3, 5, 20, 33, 38, 38, 51
Giddens, Anthony, 273n. 79
Giolito, Gabriele, 116–18, 129, 131, 134, 146, 317n. 3
grammatical treatises, 14, 19, 120–22, 168
Greenberg, Mitchell, 265n. 13
Greene, Roland, 266n. 21, 303n. 41, 342n. 15, 346n. 35, 349nn. 17, 21, 361n. 32
Greene, Thomas M., 273n. 2, 278n. 35, 300n. 18, 303n. 50, 322n. 35, 325n. 58, 326n. 6, 327n. 23, 329n. 38, 345n. 30, 349n. 16, 352n. 6
Greenfeld, Liah, 265n. 12; 268nn. 36, 37; 269n. 39
Greiffenberg, Catharina Regina von, 253–57
Greville, Fulke, 164, 229; *Life of Sidney*, 231–32
Grizzly, Lady, 219
Guelphs, 1, 5, 37, 38, 42
Guillaume de Lorris, 85–86, 94, 99–103, 128
Guillaume de Machaut, 85–86, 94, 99, 107

Hager, Alan, 339n. 61, 340n. 68, 346n. 2, 357n. 37
Hammons, Pamela S., 353n. 14
Hampton, Timothy, 266n. 20, 269n. 38, 298n. 6, 300n. 15, 306n. 63, 319n. 12, 322n. 32, 323n. 41, 328n. 27, 329nn. 33, 36

Hannay, Margaret P., 330nn. 3, 4, 331n. 8, 341nn. 4, 7, 8, 342n. 16, 343nn. 17, 20, 357n. 3
Henri II of France, 8, 81, 137; and patronage, 79, 96, 110–11, 113, 138–39; and statecraft, 82, 91–93, 148, 155, 157
Henry VIII of England, 163, 203–4, 206, 215, 234
Herbert, Edward, 233
Herbert, George, 195, 233, 236–37
Herbert, William, 6, 7, 163, 171, 216, 230, 233–34; poems, 194–97, 236–38
Hercules, Gallic, 92–93
Héröet, Antoine, 96, 115–16, 118–20, 122, 133, 139, 151; *L'androgyne*, 123–25; *La parfaicte amye*, 123
Hobsbawm, Eric, 264n. 11, 265n. 16
Homer, 86, 111, 116, 142
Horace, 67, 77, 86–92, 94, 116, 140, 142, 144, 145, 153; *epistle 2.3,* 86, 90; *epode 1.20,* 169; *ode 1.3,* 92; *ode 2.1,* 91; *ode 4.8,* 89, 92, 102, 105; *satire 1.6,* 169
household arrangements, 78, 171, 181, 206, 219, 233–34, 257
Huarte, Juan, 252
Hull, Isabel, 270n. 52
humanism: education, 6, 78–80, 121, 140, 145, 167–68, 204; hermeneutics, 23–24, 59–62, 106, 174; rhetoric, 93, 106, 218; scholarship, 3, 24, 58, 103, 121
Hundred Years War, 6, 14, 34, 78, 81, 201
Hurtado di Mendosa, Don Diego, 117–18
hybridity: of culture, 15, 55, 56, 70, 80–81, 118, 185, 250, 258–61; of ethnic origins, 8, 12–14, 58, 80–81, 213–14, 220, 235, 257; of language, 80–81, 101, 121, 166–68, 262. *See also* national imaginary; national sentiment

incest, 38, 95, 181, 194, 233–36, 239–41, 245–46, 248, 254. *See also* endogamy; exogamy
Ireland, 166, 169, 213
Italian language: literary vernacular, 4, 18, 20, 27–28, 60–62, 64, 68, 72; spoken vernacular, 9, 19, 68
Italy: entity and idea of, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8–11, 39, 136–37, 253; name of, 8–9; pan-Italian sentiment, 12, 23, 31, 47, 49, 51, 54, 67–68, 72–73, 117–18

James I of England, 8, 181, 186, 251; and statecraft, 163, 178–79, 185, 197, 215, 229, 232; "A Schort Treatise," 169
Jean de Meun, 85–86, 94, 99–103, 128
Jones, Ann Rosalind, 345n. 29, 346n. 35
Jonson, Ben, 233, 334n. 29; *Epigramme 103,* 216–17; "To Penshurst," 215–16; "To Sir Robert Wroth," 216
Juana Inéz de la Cruz, Sor, 257–61

Kaske, Carol V., 341n. 9
Kristeva, Julia, 271n. 66, 272n. 77, 354n. 20, 361n. 29
Kritzman, Lawrence D., 328n. 24
Kuin, Roger, 276n. 19, 346n. 35, 349n. 21, 355n. 27, 361n. 32

Lamb, Mary Ellen, 341n. 6, 347n. 5, 360n. 22, 361n. 27
Landino, Cristoforo, 59–61
language, standardization of, 15–18, 20, 83–85, 87–88, 166–69; and literary canon, 60–62, 100–103, 119–21. *See also* national imaginary
Lanyer, Aemelia, 218–20
Latin language: classical, 18, 45, 62, 80, 85, 90, 105–6, 140, 167; humanist, 17, 68, 80, 88, 121–23, 127, 154, 168, 230, 251; medieval, 9, 13, 15, 31
Lazzaro, Claudia, 267n. 26, 269nn. 42, 43, 44
Leicester, Earl of, 164, 169, 181, 203, 212
Lemaire de Belges, Jean, 81, 94, 96, 103, 105–6, 113, 114, 128
Levinas, Emmanuel, 271n. 66
Lewis, Philip E., 324n. 45
Lewis IV of Bavaria, 49–51
liberty, personal (*libertas*), 7, 33, 38, 39, 179, 201, 210, 232, 243; and inheritance, 169, 178, 182, 221–29
literacy, 7, 16–17, 58–61, 78–80, 170, 174, 211

literary canon: classical, 156, 231; early modern, 115–16, 141–43, 170, 198–99, 203, 216, 334n. 33; medieval, 6, 46–48, 60–62, 99–100, 102–4, 203. *See also* national imaginary
literary language, 60–62, 105–6, 119–21, 168. *See also* national imaginary; vernacular languages
Livy, 33, 223
Logan, Marie-Rose, 306n. 66, 343n. 18
Loire valley, 78, 81, 96, 100–101, 138–39
London, 2, 15, 16, 166, 169, 170, 184, 214, 216–27, 261
Long, Kathleen, 328n. 24
Lorenzo de' Medici, 5, 44, 58–67, 90, 193, 230, 253, 261; *Comento*, 58, 61–67, 90; "Raccolta aragonese," 67
loyalty, networks of: personal across ranks, 18, 207, 216, 219–20, 261; personal among equals, 77, 138–40, 174, 181, 211, 229; political, 67–70, 80, 117, 180, 226, 232, 248, 261; professional, 47–48, 103–4, 138–40, 170, 174–75, 196–97, 216, 232. *See also* allegiances; national sentiment; social class
Lutheran reform, 3, 7, 50, 51–53, 80, 91, 136, 253
Lyon, 2, 87, 96, 119, 123, 125, 127

Malatesta, Pandolfo, 40, 44–45
Marguerite d'Angoulême (Marguerite de Navarre), 101, 104, 110, 119, 123, 249
Marguerite de France, 82–83, 137, 139, 144, 149, 157
Marot, Clément, 6, 94, 95, 122, 125–26, 128, 133, 135, 144, 174, 184; and the classics, 102, 104–5, 151; and the French canon, 101–13, 115–16, 118–20, 139, 151; as translator of Petrarch, 107–10. Works: *Adolescence clémentine*, 106; "Des poetes francoys," 102–4; *L'enfer*, 104–5; epigrams, 107; rondeaux, 107; sonnets, 107–10, 315n. 47; *Suite de l'adolescence clémentine*, 106
Mazzotta, Giuseppe, 267n. 29, 273n. 1, 274n. 30, 278n. 30, 344n. 31
Meigret, Louis, 16, 121
Meschinot, Jean, 103, 104
Mexico City, 257–61
Migiel, Marilyn, 284n. 1
Milan, 2, 3, 26, 39, 44, 65, 70–71, 126, 136
Mirollo, James, 321n. 23
Moffett, Thomas, *Nobilis*, 196–97
Molinet, Jean, 96, 101, 103, 107
Monster, 188
Montaigne, Michel Equem de, 252, 268n. 38, 300n. 17, 353n. 11
mother tongue, 17, 37, 249–50, 257
Mulcaster, Richard, 16, 167–68
Murphy, Stephen, 279nn. 35, 38

Najemy, John, 264n. 5, 273n. 1, 274n. 8
Naples, 2, 3, 5, 8, 50, 54–57, 61, 67–73, 117, 136, 213
nation: Biblical ideas of, 51, 184, 241; concepts of, 4, 11, 17–18, 137, 217, 223, 250; early modern formations of, 78, 92, 163, 200–203, 230–32, 252
national identity: and "the Other" as external opposition, 2, 95, 124, 136, 154, 163, 213–14, 251; and "the Other" as internal counterpoint, 15, 95–96, 184, 220, 235, 245–46; and "the people," 4, 19, 51, 95–96, 145, 153, 170, 220, 235, 249, 260–61. *See also* England; France; Germany; Italy; people, the idea of a; Spain
national imaginary: and culture, 5, 15, 95–96, 170, 184, 213–14, 216, 220, 235, 250, 261–62; and language, 19, 61–62, 80, 96, 102, 121, 158, 166, 230–31, 260. *See also* language, standardization of; literary canon; literary language; vernacular languages
national sentiment: and cultural history, 19–20, 113, 229–30, 260; as galvanizing agent, 18–19, 48, 53, 91–92, 154; and historical remembrance, 2, 12, 14–15, 48, 50, 53, 68, 134, 213–14, 249–50, 260; and personal loyalties, 4, 8, 18–19, 73, 77, 82, 113, 129, 139, 158, 163–65, 204, 219–20; and political loyalties,

67–70, 80, 117, 180, 226, 232, 248–50, 261–62; and public display, 7, 18, 20, 68, 91, 110, 117, 124, 154, 183–84, 251–53. *See also* allegiances; loyalty, networks of; national imaginary; *patria;* people, the idea of a; regional identity; siblinghood; social class; translocal attachments
nation-state, 6, 18, 86, 137, 201, 218, 251; as bureaucratic administration, 7, 78, 91, 163–65. *See also* bureaucratic apparatus of state
Navarrete, Ignacio, 303nn. 39, 43, 304n. 53
Negri, Antonio, 273nn. 78, 80
New World, 2, 83, 137, 196, 219, 232, 249–50, 257–61
Nichols, Stephen, 308n. 13
nobility: courtly, 7, 8, 18, 55, 79, 93, 104, 140, 164, 170; marriage into, 55, 186; military, 18, 78, 164, 178, 201, 232; pacified, 93, 170, 202–5, 232; privileges of, 57, 93, 140, 145, 158–59, 178, 186, 211, 216; service to the nation, 179–80, 196–97, 216, 227. *See also* allegiances; courtly ethos; social class
Norton, Glyn, 289n. 24, 303n. 50, 304n. 52, 322n. 32
Norton, Mary Beth, 361n. 34
Nuremberg, 254–55

Opitz, Martin, 16, 254
Ovid, 56, 61, 77, 85, 100, 149–50, 153, 186, 194, 238; *Amores 1.1* and *1.2,* 31–32; *Amores 1.12,* 154; *Ex Ponto*, 154; *Fasti*, 169; *Heroides*, 150; *Met. 1,* 149; *Met. 3,* 195; *Met. 5* and *9,* 239, 242

papacy: criticism of, 3, 34, 44, 110, 114, 147–48; and European unity, 7, 29, 31, 80–81, 163–65, 168, 253–59; and political coercion, 48–49, 91, 135–37, 182, 232
Paris, 30, 93, 100, 120–21, 123, 125, 148, 153, 155
Parker, Deborah, 264nn. 6, 7, 9, 281n. 12, 291n. 31, 321n. 25
paternal bloodlines, 38, 45, 169, 181, 204; and inheritance, 178, 221, 226, 229, 234
patria, 5, 8, 92, 132, 222, 226; and cultural identity, 11, 19, 35, 37, 43, 53–54, 62, 86, 106, 288n. 21; and political attachment, 17, 25, 28, 30, 43, 53, 67, 117, 158, 196, 298n. 8
patronage, 8, 124–26; and Boccaccio, 56; and Carteo, 70–72; and Du Bellay, 79, 82–83, 91, 92, 101, 124–26, 128, 137, 139, 148, 149, 157–58; and Petrarch, 26–27, 38–41, 44–45; political, 36, 44, 65; and the Sidney circle, 171, 194, 216, 219–20, 229–30
Peletier du Mans, Jacques, 16, 89, 102, 111–12, 122, 134, 151, 157
people, the idea of a: ethnic, 10, 13, 81, 185–86, 213–14, 253; political, 19, 53, 158, 179–80, 232, 250, 260–62; regional, 33, 55, 95–96, 101–4, 117–18, 170, 213–14, 216, 229–32. See also *ethnos; gens, gentes*
Perry, Curtis, 350n. 27, 357n. 38
Peterson, Richard, 352nn. 5, 6, 8
Petrarch, Francesco, 60, 87, 104–5, 117, 129; and allegiances, 23–24; and *amor,* 28–29, 30, 31–53; at Arquà, 26; at Avignon, 23, 25, 28, 42, 46, 48, 113–14, 192; and Black Death, 23, 26, 34, 38; and Boccaccio, 27, 46, 52, 54, 57; and Charles IV, 50; and Cicero, 24–25, 27, 29; and Cino da Pistoia, 43, 46, 47; and classics, 3, 5, 222; and Cola di Rienzo, 30, 35, 36, 38; and Giacomo Colonna, 28–29, 30, 34–36, 41, 44, 45; and Dante, 24, 27–28, 47; and exile, 4, 23–24, 38; and father, 5, 25; and Florence, 31, 37, 38, 42–43; and Laura, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 39, 41, 42–44, 46, 47, 49, 62–63, 190–92; and language, 18, 20, 24–25; and Pandolfo Malatesta, 40, 44–45; at Milan, 26–27, 39, 192; and mother, 25; and papacy, 3, 7, 44, 48, 110, 113–14; and *patria*, 25, 28, 30, 35, 37, 43; and Roman Republic, 24–25, 28; and Rome in the present, 29, 30–31,

Petrarch, Francesco (*cont.*)
35, 37, 191–92; and travel, 2, 34; at Vaucluse, 10, 26, 28, 37, 38, 46; and Visconti, 26, 36, 38–41, 43, 48–49, 63, 65
—, works: *Africa*, 28, 31, 32–34, 223; *Bucolicum carmen*, 35–36; Coronation Oration, 29; *Fam. 1.1*, 23–26; *Fam. 2.9*, 28–29; *Fam. 5.3*, 54; *Fam. 5.10*, 48; *Fam. 8.3*, 28; *Fam. 15.3*, 37; *Fam. 16.11*, 26; *Fam. 17.10*, 38; *Fam. 21.15*, 27–28, 261; *Metrical Epistles*, 24, 26; *Secretum*, 38; *Triumphs*, 47, 106–7, 112, 126; *Triumph of Death 2*, 242–46
—, *Rime sparse*, 1, 5, 8, 61, 77, 83–85, 125, 177, 188, 198; *canz. 23*, 242, 245; *canz. 53*, 10; *canz. 128*, 10, 48–53, 70–72; *canz. 323*, 107, 135–37; *canz. 360*, 33, 260; *son. 1*, 53, 62–64; *son. 3*, 31; *son. 8*, 40; *son. 15*, 64–65; *son. 16*, 39–40, 190–92; *son. 20*, 140; *son. 24*, 46; *son. 25–28*, 10, 43; *son.* 40, 45; *son. 45*, 246–47; *son. 61*, 153; *son. 62*, 256; *son. 67–69*, 41; *son. 74*, 32; *son. 78*, 41; *son. 93*, 142; *son. 95*, 224; *son. 97*, 32, 221–27; *son. 98*, 40, 221; *son. 99*, 10; *son. 114–17*, 146–48; *son. 132*, 111–12; *son. 136–38*, 155; *son. 140*, 204–7; *son. 145*, 227; *son. 148*, 112–13; *son. 159*, 65–66; *son. 166*, 45–46; *son. 167*, 133, 143; *son. 169*, 221, 224–29; *son. 174*, 32; *son. 179*, 98; *son. 194*, 10; *son. 211*, 188–89; *son. 212*, 259; *son. 224*, 245; *son. 229*, 96–99; *son. 247*, 109, 116, 138, 143; *son. 248*, 108–10, 115–16, 127–28, 134, 135, 139, 141–42, 174–76; *son. 262*, 208–10; *son. 275*, 32; *son. 287*, 47; *son. 322*, 45; *son. 355*, 132; *son. 362*, 131–32
Philieul, Vasquin, 111–13
Pindar, 91, 116, 138, 140, 142, 144–45, 151, 208, 259, 262
Plato, 34, 59, 123, 134, 157, 180, 199–200, 207, 222, 259, 292n. 42
Pléiade, 6, 48, 79, 136, 193
political identity, 19, 30–31; of England, 11, 166–70, 184–85, 201, 214, 235, 252; of France, 14, 80–82, 95–96, 103–4, 121, 252; of Germany, 13, 253; of Italy, 10, 43–44, 50–52, 117–18, 253; of Spain, 14, 83, 249, 252, 257–61
Poliziano, Angelo, 59–62, 290n. 30
popular culture, 16, 27; England, 168–70, 198, 201–2, 216; Florence, 58–59, 64; France, 80, 96, 120, 158; Germany, 255; Spain, 84, 257–58
Posner, David, 298n. 6, 300n. 17
Prescott, Ann Lake, 323n. 43, 331n. 10, 342n. 15, 343nn. 18, 19, 20, 355n. 26
print culture, 7, 12, 106, 120–22, 171, 177–78, 218. *See also* literacy
Propertius, 56, 67–69
Protestant sentiment, 7, 20, 51–52; in England, 164, 171, 182–86, 200, 226, 231, 237; in France, 80–81, 91, 110, 131–32, 136, 148; in Germany, 253–57. *See also* Calvin, Jean; Lutheran reform
Provence, 5, 9, 13, 18, 37, 56, 81, 84, 87, 124, 296n. 3
Puttenham, George, 16, 167, 202

Quilligan, Maureen, 238n. 58, 352n. 10, 361n. 28

race (*radix*), 12, 19, 145
"Radical Protestant," 164, 171, 182, 231
Rebhorn, Wayne, 275n. 11, 304n. 53, 305n. 62, 325n. 55
Reformation, 3, 6, 7, 50, 51, 80, 91, 130
regional identity: in England, 166–67, 179, 212–13, 219–20; in France, 77, 80, 82, 100, 103–4, 113, 117–18, 119, 120, 122, 138–39, 148; in Italy, 4, 53, 67
religious pluralism, 80–81, 110, 130–31, 137, 148, 164, 253–54, 257–58, 261
Resina, Joan Ramòn, 302n. 38, 364n. 24
rhetorical treatises, 19, 60, 84, 88, 104, 167, 230, 252
Rhétoriqueurs, 6, 96, 100, 103, 105–7, 112, 128, 133
Richardson, Brian, 263n. 2
Rigolot, François, 302n. 36, 307n. 6, 314n. 38, 321n. 27, 323n. 38, 329n. 38
Robert, king of Naples, 2, 31, 34, 54, 55
Robertet, Jean, 96, 106–7

Roche, Thomas, 345n. 35, 352n. 9, 355n. 28, 356n. 34
romance of origins, 6, 15, 25–26, 37–39, 78–81, 138, 170, 235; and cultural self-fashioning, 55–56, 58, 152, 189–90, 260. *See also* family romance
Rome: ancient, 3, 5, 29, 36, 134–37, 166, 222–23, 260; papal, 2, 4, 29, 30–31, 50, 135–37, 146, 148, 153, 155, 213; Roman Empire, 9, 61–62, 88, 89–90, 149; Roman Republic, 9, 24, 33, 39, 87, 89–90, 93, 222–23
Ronsard, Pierre de, 6, 49, 107, 116, 121, 130, 134, 138–59, 174, 354n. 22; *Les Amours, son. 58*, 144–46; —, *son. 91*, 146, 149; *Le Bocage*, 148; *Discours*, 146; *Franciade*, 156; *Odes*, 138, 140, 141, 144, 145, 149

Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, 94, 107, 115–16, 118–20, 122, 133, 139, 144, 151; sonnets, 125–26
Saint-Gelais, Octovien de, 103, 104, 128
Salel, Hughes, 96, 102, 103, 151, 360n. 24
Santagata, Marco, xi, 280n. 41, 281nn. 10, 11, 282nn. 22, 23, 24, 293n. 49, 294n. 51
Scève, Maurice, 96, 107, 115–16, 118–20, 122, 133, 139, 151; *Délie 1* and *6,* 128; *Délie 276,* 128–29; *Délie 278,* 127–28
Scotland, 166, 169, 185, 213
Scripture, 3, 38, 52, 85, 104, 131–32, 184, 198, 218–20, 227; 1 Corinthians, 226; 2 Corinthians, 220–22; Deuteronomy, 234; Ecclesiastes, 52; Genesis 12:2 and 15:4, 11–12; John, 247; Leviticus, 234; Matthew, 247; Psalms, 85, 185, 240–41; Romans, 52, 131; Ruth, 220; 1 Timothy, 226
Sebillet, Thomas, 86–87, 158
Sennuccio, 47, 57
Seyssel, Claude, 82, 298n. 5
Shakespeare, William, 8, 233; *Hamlet*, 268n. 38; *The Merchant of Venice*, 12; *Pericles*, 234; *The Rape of Lucrece*, 354n. 24
siblinghood, 7, 234, 241, 245–46, 248–49, 260
Siculo-Tuscan literary vernacular, 5, 18
Sidney, Mary, countess of Pembroke, 6, 7, 8, 163, 215, 261; as patroness, 171, 196, 219, 236; as writer, 182, 218, 219, 237
—, works: *Discourse of Life and Death*, 164; *Psalms*, 182, 185–86, 219; *Ps. 44*, 184; *Ps. 69*, 240; *Ps. 72*, 186; *Ps. 100*, 343n. 17; *Ps. 104*, 240–41; *Ps. 107*, 241; *Ps. 133*, 241; *Ps. 150*, 343n. 17; *Tragedie of Antonie*, 182–83; *Triumph of Death*, 4, 164, 182, 242–45
Sidney, Philip, 6, 7, 8, 107, 163, 164, 181, 217, 218; and father, 7, 163–64, 169, 181, 215, 218; and mother, 7, 169, 181, 224
—, works: *Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, 165, 223, 254; *Defence of Poetry*, 4, 17, 165–70, 198–204, 208, 211, 214, 236, 237, 261; *Discourse on Irish Affairs*, 169; *New Arcadia*, 164, 171, 338n. 58; *Old Arcadia*, 164, 168, 171, 177, 204, 223, 338n. 57
—, *Astrophil and Stella*, 4, 165, 180, 181, 187–88, 198, 236; *son. 1*, 177, 211, 236; *son. 3*, 177, 208; *son. 15*, 177, 199, 335n. 42; *son. 18*, 171, 193, 208; *son. 21*, 171, 208; *son. 28*, 176; *son. 47*, 220–27; *son. 63*, 211; *son. 71*, 174–76; *son. 74*, 176–77; *son. 91*, 193; *son. 107*, 208
Sidney, Robert, 6, 7, 163, 171, 181, 215, 217, 218, 237; sonnets, 186–88, 190, 193
Smith, Alan K., 288n. 21, 313n. 32
social class, 11, 19, 55, 58, 158, 261; and ethnic origin, 14, 15, 55, 166–67, 257–58; and gender, 17, 23, 78–80, 93, 171, 200–202, 211, 226–27, 234; and loyalty, 6, 8, 77, 84, 85, 102–4, 178, 180, 202–7, 215–18, 249–50. *See also* endogamy, exogamy
Spain, 2, 6, 8, 67–69, 83–85, 134–37, 164, 179, 182, 252; name of, 13–14; Nueva España, 137, 232, 249–50, 257–61
Spanish language, literary vernacular, 4, 14, 83–84
Spenser, Edmund, 8, 167, 168, 169, 198, 203, 351n. 36

Squarzafico, Hieronimo, 3, 20, 39, 55–56, 70, 251; and Petrarch, *son. 140*, 205; —, *son. 159*, 66; —, *son. 248*, 109–10, 141; —, *son. 262*, 209
Stephens, Walter, 267n. 23, 301n. 29, 306n. 65
Stil novisti, as Petrarch's predecessors, 46–48, 56, 142, 193
Stone, Donald, 307n. 2, 313n. 33, 321nn. 27, 28, 341n. 7
Sturm-Maddox, Sara, 276n. 19, 282n. 18, 291n. 35, 315n. 46, 326n. 3, 360n. 22
supraregional identification, 4, 18, 116–18; Cariteo's, 67–68; Du Bellay's, 80, 91, 100–104, 119–20, 128, 138, 158–59; in Germany, 255; in New World, 257–61; Petrarch's, 25, 30–31, 37, 43, 44, 58; within Sidney circle, 185–86, 201, 212–13, 220, 234, 248–51
Surrey, Henry Howard, earl of, 177, 198, 202–8
Sylvano da Venafro, 3, 20, 251; and Petrarch, *canz. 128*, 50–51; —, *son. 16*, 191; —, *son. 115*, 150; —, *son. 140*, 205; —, *son. 169*, 225

taboo, 5, 6, 38; and cultural competition, 5, 6, 39, 95, 115, 122, 139, 158, 260, 261; and political order, 38, 39, 49, 51, 203, 234, 239, 246, 249, 254. *See also* fraternal strife; totems
Thirty Years War, 6, 178, 253
Tory, Geoffroy, 16, 121
totems, 5, 6, 37, 94; and cultural patrimony, 5, 6, 53, 58, 60, 77, 94–96, 111, 114, 122, 165, 170–71, 258; and political allegiance, 18, 37, 53, 165, 248–50, 260, 261, 332n. 12. *See also* fraternal strife; taboo
Tottel, Richard, 177, 202–3, 205
transitional space, 18, 70, 185, 189, 194, 197, 211, 247–49
translatio studii et imperii, 84, 90, 113, 135
translocal attachments, 4, 18, 116–18; Cariteo's, 67–68; Du Bellay's, 80, 100–104, 119–20, 128, 138, 158–59; in Germany, 255; in New World, 257–61; Petrarch's, 25–26, 36, 44; within Sidney circle, 185–86, 201, 212–13, 220, 234, 248–51
transnational attachments: and cultural appropriation, 18, 44–48, 101, 103–4, 117, 138–39, 219–20, 230, 248–50, 255, 257; and politics, 53, 91, 103–4, 117, 179, 185, 248–50
travel: and arranged marriage, 219–20; and exile, 2, 23–25, 37, 126; and political service, 68, 153–57, 187, 190–93, 196, 231–32, 251–52; and study, 10–11, 82
Tuke, Brian, 166–67
Tuscan vernacular, literary forms: and Alamanni, 126; and Cariteo, 68, 69, 72; and Giolito, 117; and Lorenzo de' Medici, 60–62, 64; and Petrarch, 2, 5, 18, 19–20, 90, 105–6, 113
Tuscan vernacular, spoken dialect, 2, 18, 60–61, 90, 105–6
Tyard, Pontus de, 133–34, 139, 151, 174

urban culture: France, 79, 82, 93; London, 170, 179–80, 201–2, 215–17; Lyon, 95–96, 119–20, 127; Nuremberg, 254–55; Paris, 99, 101–2, 104, 127, 158–59

Valois dynasty, 81, 82, 91, 120, 137
Vaucluse, 10, 26, 28, 37, 38, 46, 112–13, 124, 147–48, 259
Vellutello, Alessandro, 3, 20, 53, 60, 69, 112, 174, 227, 251
—, and Petrarch: *canz. 23*, 242; *canz. 28*, 283n. 27; *canz. 128*, 49–50; *canz. 360*, 260; *son. 7*, 46–47; *son. 10*, 44–45; *son. 24*, 46, 83; *son. 92*, 47; *son. 115*, 149; *son. 136–38*, 48; *son. 140*, 205; *son. 166*, 45–46; *son. 169*, 228; *son. 212*, 259; *son. 226*, 85; *son. 229*, 98; *son. 248*, 109–10; *son. 262*, 209–10; *son. 287*, 47; *son. 322*, 45; *Trionfo della morte 2*, 244–45
vernacular languages: literary forms, 14, 80, 86, 100–103, 113, 168, 255; poetic models in, 4, 8, 18, 20, 60–62, 64, 68, 72, 82–84, 105–6, 119–21, 170, 202–3;

spoken forms, 9, 15–17, 19, 20, 68, 80, 86, 100–101, 105–6, 119–21, 166–70, 178–79, 205, 261. *See also* English language; French language; German language; Italian language; Spanish language
Villon, François, 85–86, 94, 102, 103
Virgil, 59–60, 77, 85, 88, 92, 104–5, 111, 116, 129, 142, 151; *Eclogue 3,* 27–28; *Georgics,* 9, 29–30; *Aeneid 6.823,* 30, 35, 222–27; *Aeneid 11,* 25
Visconti lords, 2, 3, 10, 26, 33, 36, 38, 40–41, 48–49, 50, 51, 58, 63–65, 70, 141
visual role in commentary, 2, 106, 122

Wales, 166, 169, 213
Wallace, David, 275nn. 13, 14; 332n. 14
Wallerstein, Immanuel, 272n. 68
Wars of Religion, France, 80–81, 137
Watson, Thomas, *Hekatompathia*, 176–77
Weber, Henri, 305n. 56, 315n. 46, 325n. 1, 326n. 12
Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, 263nn. 1, 3, 275n. 13, 277nn. 24, 25, 280n. 1, 283n. 28
Witt, Ronald, 273n. 1, 279nn. 36, 39
women as conveyors of translocal attachment: through arranged marriages, 18, 110–11, 113, 171, 212–13, 216, 219–20, 234, 239, 248–51; through writing, 171, 219–20, 254, 257–58
Wroth, Lady Mary, 6, 7, 8, 163, 171, 186, 200, 236, 255; and family allegiances, 163–64, 181, 186, 216–18, 233–34, 261
—, works: *Love's Victory*, 183; *Urania*, 17, 163, 165, 171–72, 178, 179–80, 212; —, First Part, 172–73, 212–14, 227, 235–36, 247–48, 338nn. 56, 59; —, Second Part, 173, 197, 233, 235, 248, 337n. 55, 338n. 56
—, *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*, 4, 8, 163, 165, 173, 180, 197, 251; *Crowne of Sonnets*, 188–89; *son. 10*, 190–93; *son. 14*, 220–21, 227–29; *son. 24*, 208–11; *son. 39*, 195; *son. 40*, 195–96; *son. 44*, 238–41, 248; *son. 46*, 246–48; *son. 2* (second series), 237; *son. 6* (second series), 212–13
Wyatt, Thomas, 177, 202–8

Žižek, Slavoj, 273n. 80